DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 066 JC 690 328

Private Junior Colleges: Problems and Solutions; Selected Proceedings of Two Special Workshops on Private Junior Colleges (Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tenn., Sept. 27-28, 1968; Montreat Anderson College, Montreat, N.C., Nov. 1-2, 1968).

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Program with Developing Institutions.

Report No-AAJC-PWDI-Monograph-2

Pub Date Dec 68

Note-52p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70

Descriptors-*College Planning, Conferences, Estate Planning, *Financial Support, *Junior Colleges, Planning, *Private Colleges, Workshops

Identifiers-American Association of Junior Colleges, *Program with Developing Institutions

This monograph outlines the problems (and possible solutions) of private junior colleges, as discussed at two regional conferences in 1968. The two meetings were attended by 108 representatives from 50 colleges. Both stressed the importance of long-range development planning and its accompanying need for funds. Particular points covered were alumni and annual giving programs, capital-raising campaigns, effective approaches to foundations and corporations, government grants, deferred giving in the form of bequests, annuities, insurance, etc. Details on the methods of bestowing deferred gifts were given--useful in persuading the prospective donor of the benefits both to himself and to the college. Other speakers dealt with the advantages and special opportunities of private colleges and with the concept and practice of cooperative (work-study) education. Most participants, in evaluating the conferences, found them very valuable; the small remainder found them of considerable value. They also gave suggestions for future workshops. (HH)

PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Selected proceedings of two special workshops on private junior colleges which were held at: Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tenn., Sept. 27-28, 1968; and Montreat Anderson College, Montreat, North Carolina, Nov. 1-2, 1968.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
Program With Developing Institutions
1225 Connecticut Ave.,N.W.,#304
Washington, D.C., 20036

December, 1968

INTRODUCTION

In August, 1968, at a regional conference of developing junior colleges in Huntsville, Alabama, presidents or deans of five private junior colleges in Tennessee expressed the view that they would benefit greatly from a workshop on problems peculiar to the private college -- particularly fund raising and other techniques for survival in this period when comprehensive public community colleges are coming into being at a rapid rate.

President Ernest Stockton of Cumberland College of Tennessee offered to host such a meeting if the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions would sponsor it. In subsequent conversations he agreed to expand the conference into a regional workshop for all private junior colleges in our Program west of the Appalachians, which was thought sufficient ground to cover for an experimental workshop.

The sessions at Lebanon, attended by 48 representatives of 20 colleges on September 27-28, were highly successful. Of 32 college representatives who returned evaluation questionnaires on the conference, 29 gave it the highest possible rating on a five-point scale ("very valuable"), and the other three the second highest rating ("considerable value").

In the light of this experience, it was deemed essential to give an equivalent opportunity to attend such a workshop to representatives of private junior colleges on the East Coast, who had not been invited to the Lebanon conference. Montreat-Anderson College in Montreat, N.C., agreed to host the second conference on November 1-2.

The Montreat conference was attended by about 60 representatives of 30 private junior colleges, coming from 11 states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. While the workshops covered some of the same ground as the Lebanon conference, many new ideas were presented which gave the proceedings additional value in compiling the record of the two meetings.

Selected papers and excerpts from the discussion at both conferences have therefore been compiled to make a permanent record of the two private college workshops in this little book. It is hoped that it will have some value not only to the colleges in our program, but to other private junior colleges as well.

SELDEN MENEFEE
Director, AAJC Program
With Developing Institutions
Washington, D.C.

December, 1968

PART I

<u>THE LEBANON CONFERENCE</u>

Lebanon, Tennessee

September 27-28, 1968

Host:

Cumberland College of Tennessee

P R O G R A M

Private Junior College Workshop
AAJC Program With Developing Institutions
Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tenn., September 27-28, 1968

Friday, September 27:

9:00 A.M.	- Welcome and introductions. Remarks - Selden Menefee, Director, AAJC Program With Developing Institutions
9:30 A.M.	- Long-range Planning for Development -- Objectives, Needs, Plans, and Programs - Tedd Kelly, Washington, D.C.
10:00 A.M.	- Panel Discussion: Dr. W. Burkette Raper, N.C. Dr. Richard Sneed, Okla. Mr. David Woodall, Tenn.
10:30 A.M.	- Alumni and Annual Giving Programs - Mr. David Woodall, Tenn.
11:15 A.M.	- Panel Discussion: Dr. Walter A. Graham, Ala. Mr. Tedd Kelly, Washington, D.C. Dr. Richard Steele, Miss.
2:00 P.M.	- The Capital Campaign -- Dr. Walter A. Graham
2:45 P.M.	- Panel Discussion: Mr. Tedd Kelly Dr. W. Burkette Raper Dr. Richard Sneed Dr. Joe L. Mayes, Ga.
3:30 P.M.	- Approaches to Foundations and Corporations - Dr. Joe L. Mayes
4:00 P.M.	- Panel Discussion: Dr. Walter Graham Dr. Richard Sneed Dr. Richard Steele
7:00 P.M.	- Dinner Speaker: "The Place and Role of the Private Two-year College--Its Opportunities, Challenges, and Community Service Potential" - Dr. W. Burkette Raper

Saturday, September 28:

9:00 A.M.	- Government Grants for Developing Colleges - Dr. David Smith, USOE, Washington, D.C.
9:45 A.M.	- Panel Discussion: Dr. Walter Graham Dr. Richard Sneed Dr. Richard Steele
10:30 A.M.	- Deferred Giving (Bequests, annuities, life insurance, life income agreements, trusts) - Mr. William J. Sweeting, Kennedy-Sinclaire
11:00 A.M.	- Panel Discussion: Dr. W. Burkette Raper Dr. Richard Sneed Mr. Winstead P. Bone, III, Tenn.
11:30 A.M.	- Conference Summation - Mr. Selden Menefee

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE AAJC DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS WORKSHOP ON THE PROBLEMS OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tenn., September 27-28, 1968

* * *

Consultants:

Walter A. Graham	President, Southern Union State Junior College, Ala.
Todd Kelly	President, Educational Resources and Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.
W. Burkette Raper	President. Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.
Rev. Richard Sneed	President, St. Gregory's College, Okla.
Richard A. Steele	Director of Research and Development, Mary Holmes College, Miss.
David Woodall	Director of Development, Vanderbilt University, Tenn.
Joe L. Mayes	Vice Pres.& Regional Mgr.,Southeastern Div.of Natl.Fund Raising Svs.,Ga.
William J. Sweeting	Representative, Kennedy-Sinclaire, Inc., N.J.
David W. Smith	Education Specialist, Div. of College Support, USOE, Washington, D.C.
Selden Menefee	Director, AAJC Program With Developing Institutions, Washington, D.C.

College Representatives:

Alice Lloyd College, Ky.	- William S. Hayes, President William F. Engert, Administrator
Aquinas Junior College, Tenn.	- Sister Henry Suso, President Sister Dominica Gobel, Dean
Cumberland College, Tenn.	- Ernest L. Stockton, President Jack H. Howard, Academic Dean Daryl Robinson, Dean of Students Thomas H. Outlawe, Business Manager Winstead P. Bone,III, Director of Development
Freed-Hardeman College, Tenn.	- H. A. Dixon, President E. Claude Gardner, Dean
Hiwassee College, Tenn.	- Horace N. Barker, President James H. Amburgey, Dean
Lees Junior College, Ky.	- Troy R. Eslinger, President Wendell C. Galloway, Director of Development
Martin College, Tenn.	- W. C. Westenberger, President
Mary Holmes College, Miss.	- Richard A. Steele, Director of Research & Development
Mercy Junior College, Mo.	- Sister Mary Yvonne, Registrar Sister Mary Robert, Director of Student Activities
Morristown College, Tenn.	- James T. Northern, Dean-Registrar
Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.	- W. Burkette Raper, President
Ottumwa Heights College, Iowa	- Sister Agnese Dowling, Business Manager Sister Madeleine Marie Schmidt, Coordinator of Financial Aids
Sacred Heart College, Ala.	- Sister Mary Lourdes Michel, President
Saint Catharine College, Ky.	- Sister Margaret Marie Hofstetter, President Sister Marie Francesca Cameron, Academic Dean
St. Gregory's College, Okla.	- Rev. Richard Sneed, President Thomas C. Clary, Vice Pres. for Finance & Development
Southeastern Christian College, Ky.	- L. V. Houtz, President Curtis Lydic, Dean Glenn Baber, Trustee H. C. Weber, Trustee
Southern Baptist College, Ark.	- H. E. Williams, President Lendol Jackson, Asst. to the Pres. for Promotion and Development
Southern Union State Junior College,Ala.	- Walter A. Graham, President
Suomi College, Mich.	- Robert E. Schlichter, Director of College Relations
York College, Nebr.	- Joe K. Alley, Vice President Arthur Francis, Director of Development

LONG RANGE PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Talk by Tedd Kelly, President,
Consultants for Educational Resources and Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Often it is felt that the best way to get rid of a problem is to talk it to death; hence the origin of committees, seminars, workshops, and conferences. There is almost a ratio here: the more important the problem, the larger the group that it takes to talk about it. I was exposed to an example of this recently when I attended a conference of private colleges in New York City. Admissions and guidance officers were gathered to discuss the problems of admissions, many of which are caused by the decline in the student population. Much talk resulted, some actions were taken, and many will feel that solutions resulted and progress has been made. But the real problem was not faced while I was there -- to get the forum for the message that is needed: colleges need students. The cab driver who took me to the airport was complaining that colleges were so overcrowded his son joined the army rather than face rejection by colleges. The most common reaction I get from the man in the streets is that colleges even now have more students knocking at their doors than they can admit. Students are not applying who could be admitted, income is less, and the quality of education suffers.

It may sound strange to hear this emphasis on student recruitment at a meeting on funding, but I would suggest that the illustration is closer to hand than one often realizes. Student enrollment and funding income are so closely related that they often become the two sides of the same coin. And to make it a perfectly obvious equation: for every student not enrolled as planned, that much more financial support must come from other sources or the budget must be cut.

How does all this come together? Long range planning for development, by definition, must mean "the systematic projection for a stated period of time of the best utilization of all resources of an institution for the achievement of agreed upon goals and purposes as formulated by those to be served or benefited by the college's programs."

If this definition is too long and you want a shorter definition, I would say that long range planning for development means a lot of hard work by a lot of people for a long time.

For this moment I am going to assume I need to convince you it is necessary to have long range planning. To do this, let me quote from America of September, 1967:

> .... Scattered reports from other private institutions verify the suspicion that almost all America's private collegiate institutions are facing a critical period from which some will not emerge and that, as the price of survival, others will have to amalgamate with other institutions, surrender partial or total control, change purpose, or settle for a less selective clientele. From the point of view of strengthening the totality of American higher education, these prices may not be too high. Yet there remains a note of dismay, particularly at the thought of the threatened passing of many small liberal arts colleges with Church connections that in the past have so much enriched American society. They deserve a better fate than to follow the corner grocery store into the belly of the educational supermarket. For them and private schools generally, money -- or lack of money -- is the root of almost all evils.
>
> .... The cost of a college education, like that of most commodities involving labor costs, has soared. The U.S. Office of Education reports that in the decade 1955-55, spending for all types of schooling more than doubled, but college costs during this interval tripled. The rise was from $5 billion to $15.2 billion. In 1955 a student could figure on spending $1,815 for his year at college, but ten years later his younger brother had to spend $2,442. If they have a brother in college in 1975, he will have to put out an estimated $2,976 for his year of schooling. These are average figures for all types of colleges. If the brothers

have attended or will attend a private college, however, the average costs are and will be higher for each of the three interval years: in 1955, $1,875; in 1965, $3,102; in 1975, $4,294.

The danger is obvious: the private college will either be overpriced or underpriced out of existence, or become the extension of a highly affluent society.

[illegible], I like oversimplifications. The oversimplified solution to the prevention of the extinction of the small private college is long range planning. The college that plans together stays together.

Easier said than done. The doing is the next point, and here I go to outline form. Old friends are the best friends and anyone exposed to Journalism 101 will remember the five friendly W's -- Who, What, When, Where, and Why.

Let's reverse them and start with Why.

The first element of long range planning is a study or re-study of purpose. Can you in 25 words or less state the paramount purpose for the existence (let alone the continuing existence) of your college? Granted that some may need 50 words, but having stated it, is the purpose of your institution one that is needed today? If it isn't, stop there. You see, what is most implied in the philosophy of doom for the small private college is that it is no longer needed. Are you really needed? Have you fulfilled your need? Or are you a need whose time has yet to come?

Where does the planning take place? First and primarily on your campus, ultimately among all your various constituencies. We'll talk more about your publics under Who, but let me say now that you should expect to take some part of this study into the boondocks to learn how it really is, what they think of you, and what they want from you and what they are willing to do for you. A long range plan formulated solely in the dark recesses of the mythical ivory tower will be an impsing document. PERIOD. So plan to go where the action will be in recruiting, publicity, funding -- off campus.

When is the next question. NOW is the answer. Each institution that prepares a budget for the year to come is doing planning. Knowing the uncertainties facing many small schools, a year's planning is an act of faith. But if you can plan for one year, you can project for three years. I would suggest that you budget for one year, project for at least three, and speculate for two more segments of three years each. This 1 + 3 + 3 + 3 formula will give you the holy of holies figure of 10 years made popular by Sydney Tickton, formerly of the Ford Foundation.

To begin, start with the past tense, come to the present, and move to the future. As last year helped determine this year, the past three provide trends for the next three and a study of the next ten years will provide a revelation, if not an apocalypse.

Remember, it's better to plan ahead even by one or three years than not to plan at all.

To help you, there are many government, local, and state aids available, especially from HEW.

What to plan for? For survival, and the survival list contains many things. The more obvious are: student enrollment, faculty development, curriculum development, financial resources -- including fund raising, physical expansion, and public acceptance.

Some suggested sub-topics:

Student enrollment -- projected student population increase or decline for the area you serve. Changes in entrance requirements -- up or down? Size, composition, distribution, academic interests of students. With beards or shaved?

Faculty development -- How many or how few? Which kind: lay, mixed, or all religious? Academic requirements -- up, down, leveling off? Salary levels: by categories, seniority? Fringe benefits -- Tenure? In-service training? Sabbaticals? Leaves of absence for study? Student-teacher ratios?

Curriculum development -- Traditional, imitative, innovative, experimental? More courses, few courses? Emphasis on class attendance or independent study techniques? Objective measurement of strengths and weaknesses of academic quality? Student involvement in curriculum planning?

Financial resources -- Where is the money coming from and in what proportion from investments, tuition, alumni, parents, friends, trustees, corporations, foundations, and sponsoring agent? What will this money be needed for and how much? Will sources and those served be related? What's the plan and whose responsibility is it to get the funds? Will fiscal control be strengthened?

Physical expansion -- How much plant growth will be needed? Which kind, and where will it be? What's the best use of present facilities? By all means have a master campus plan done by specialists in this area of planning.

Public acceptance -- What will be done to bring the public up to date on the emerging developments and to get them to accept the new you? Just hanging out a sign saying "Under New Management" won't suffice.

And now we come to Who. The answer is everybody, but especially faculty and students. But also include representation from the board, community, alumni, parents, and spnsoring agent. It takes real nerve to open up the books to responsible persons in each of these groups, but the results will be worth the anguish.

Some quick words on procedure: The president and his staff should determine the need and recommend to the Board of Trustees that a long range planning program be developed. The Board should authorize the President to conduct such a study and authorize the creation of a long range planning committee to work with the president, naming the president as the liaison between the Board and this committee. The Board should also set dates at which preliminary, interim, and final reports will be made to the Board. A budget for this long range planning should be approved.

The president then should act to create this long range planning committee, naming a staff person as chairman, preferably the dean - least desirably the development man, who should be the executive secretary of the committee and liaison man between this committee and the president. Obviously there has to be good rapport between these three officers.

Th· committee should be empowered by the president to accomplish a specific and written set of objectives and pledge his full cooperation and that of other officers on the staff. The composition of this committee should be two subcommittees, a smaller inner circle of representatives of the inner family, Board, administration, faculty and students. The larger circle would include representatives of the total family. The inner circle works first and hardest and longest. The outer circle has specific responsibilities in later stages.

As the planning progresses -- and a thorough plan will take two, maybe three years -- the committee upon completion of segments sends it to the full faculty for review and recommendation to the administration. Upon administration review and refinement, these facts are held to present to the whole long range planning committee. They recommend it to the Board. The Board in return reviews, reacts, recommends changes in the preliminary and intervening reports. The final report should be in such form that little change should be needed prior to adoption by the Board.

A final word. Planning is only part of the total. Within the long range planning should be a plan for implementation which should be authorized specifically by the Board.

And a P.S. to the above final word is that planning is continuous, and a good long range plan will also have a procedure established for review, evaluation, and a method for updating the projections as needed.

* * *

DISCUSSION OF KELLY STATEMENT

Sneed: But how do you apply this to budgeting? All constituencies of the college must be brought in. All colleges must review their purposes in specific terms. You need to come up with a vigorous, inspiring statement of purposes for the college. Clarity of purpose is fundamental. Otherwise, much time and money can be wasted.. Get all your constituencies in on the periodic review of plans. Do research. We nearly put in a secretarial program until we found that a neighboring college had one which was about to be abandoned for lack of students. The role of parents is important; they are the sources of money, time, good public relations and help with planning.

Raper: You have to see the moon in planning. Every college does not have to be unique. A more valid approach is to make your program relevant. We must fill the needs of our constituencies. The church, the town, the whole area must be included. I couldn't care less about whether my college is like or unlike other colleges. What I want to know is, whether it is fulfilling its purposes.

Kelly: The President is the key person in planning. He must be thick-skinned enough to take criticism. He can delegate responsibility and should but he must be the liaison with the Board. He can lead and filter ideas but not dictate.

Raper: The President works hard and formulates ideas. However, if providence calls him, the plan should still be there.

Woodall: We made a planning study and it weighed 44 lbs. We reduced it to the size of a Sears Roebuck catalogue. This plan made a world of difference in our campaign. We were convincing because we knew where we were going.

Kelly: A college plan has convinced Lebanon that Cumberland College is here to stay. A plan helps here.

Woodall: A faculty man headed the Vanderbilt self-study. He was head of the physics department.

Graham: A dean should not head the committee. The chairman of the art department headed ours.

Kelly: It depends on the man. You might consider the dean and the faculty and pick the best man. Do your planning study along with an accreditation study or self-study for other purposes.

Graham: A plan is the first requirement for Southern Regional accreditation.

Steele: Each college will be different, if the needs of the community are met. No two situations are alike.

Raper: But we should not seek uniqueness for its own sake.

* * *

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING AN ANNUAL GIVING PROGRAM
Talk by David Woodall of Vanderbilt University, Tenn.

The success of an Annual Giving Program is directly correlated to the percent of solicitations which are made in person by a volunteer worker, instead of by mail or over the telephone. Just as importantly, the success of an Annual Giving Program is directly correlated to how often the volunteer worker will ask the prospect for a specific amount of money for a particular project (or state a preference for the contribution to be left unrestricted). All strategy, all staff effort, and all of the budget allocated to an Annual Giving Program should be aimed at ultimately achieving these two objectives.

I. Preparation for an Annual Giving Program:

A. A precise plan for the direction of the college for the next five or ten years is essential. State the objectives: academic, physical plant expansion, size of faculty and student body, community service programs, and financial needs.

B. Publish a document summarizing this plan.

C. Relate the value of an Annual Giving (A/G) Program to the success of the college plan.

D. Consider the substantial leverage achieved through a matching gift equal to one half the dollar total of the annual giving goal. Some wealthy men enjoy seeing their gift doubled. Such a matching gift makes each subsequent donor's contribution to the Annual Giving Campaign twice as valuable. This has been a very successful technique.

E. Draft a specific A/G plan including the following: a dollar objective, percentage participation goal of total number of donors to be solicited, enough volunteer workers so that each worker has only 5 prospects to solicit, enough vice chairmen so that each vice chairman has only 10 workers to keep track of, and finally a general chairman who can be as sold on the need for a successful campaign as the President of the College and a hard enough worker to put the program across.

F. An A/G schedule should be drafted requiring decisions on the following: a complimentary solicitation mailing program and its timing with the A/G program, kick off programs, report breakfasts, publicity projects.

G. Select the best possible volunteers to participate in the program. The quality of the chairman will determine the success of the program as decidedly as the two important factors mentioned in the first paragraph in this outline. Next in importance to the chairman is the vice chairman in charge of soliciting the largest gifts of the A/G program. Approximately 10 percent of the donors should be asked for special gifts of $500 to $10,000. Additional research should be done to determine best choices for other vice chairmen and for workers. Rule of thumb: There should be twice as many suggestions of names for workers as are actually needed for workers.

II. Conducting the campaign:

A. The first choice for A/G chairman should be cultivated by getting him interested first in the general college plan, then a few months later obtain the assistance of two or three other prominent businessmen to go with the President and the Director of Development to ask the first choice to serve as A/G chairman.

B. Get general chairman's approval of the A/G plan and the A/G schedule.

C. Get his firm commitment to necessary deadlines in the A/G schedule.

D. Get him to assist in evaluating the top 10 percent of all donors (designated as special gift prospects). A suggested gift range for a special gift prospect is $500 to $10,000. Evaluate a prospect considering how much he could give if he really wanted to, and then double the amount; were he able to give $1,000, then the prospect should be asked for twice that amount, that is $2000.

E. Get the general chairman to obtain one vice chairman for special gifts and enough additional vice chairman to handle 10 each of the workers required in the A/G program. Assign a deadline for getting this done.

F. Staff visits the vice chairman when obtained by the chairman. The vice chairman selects workers and assigns 5 prospects to each worker. The vice chairman must be motivated to evaluate all the prospects in his division for a size gift, then the best workers should be assigned to solicit the prospects with the highest gift evaluation. The workers

should be committed to their part in the campaign at least two months before the kick off date.

G. At the kick off date the workers are furnished their solicitation materials with clear, brief instructions and a date when they are expected to complete their work. A special appeal must always be made to see each prospect in person and ask for a specific dollar amount and to come away with the gift in hand.

H. Each vice chairman should contact each of his workers once a week following the kick off date for a progress report on each of his prospects.

I. The prospect should give his gift only to the worker who solicited him. The worker should pass the gift on only to the vice chairman to whom he reports, and the vice chairman should send the gift in to the college. The college staff makes a report of gift progress to the general chairman.

J. It is most important that the vice chairman for special gifts should complete his solicitation of prospects before December 31. This is the time of year prospects make decisions about giving in relation to their tax considerations.

K. The absolute end to an Annual Giving Program usually is the end of the college's fiscal year. One month before the end of the fiscal year an intensive effort by telephone calls and by mailings usually produces an increase of percent participation.

III. Campaign Follow-up:

A. The college staff should evaluate its own performance and the elements of success and failure during the course of the A/G campaign. The staff should visit the chairman and vice chairmen for a critique of each of the persons working for them to be used in planning future campaigns.

B. The staff should keep a weekly log describing what work was done on the campaign and an indication of how many gifts and of what dollar amount came in.

C. Thank you letters should be mailed from the college to all volunteer workers and chairmen. Also a final campaign report should be mailed to all persons solicited.

D. An awards ceremony should be considered honoring the chairman for his success.

* * *

Additional Comments and Summary:

Plan of procedure: Set up an office with a staff of two people.

1. Planning for development is the first requirement. It is imperative. You must also publish a summary of your plan. Relate the value of annual gifts to your plan.
2. Set your goal at say, $20,000. Don't raise your goal too high in any one year.
3. Try to get one man to put up matching funds. Some people enjoy giving money away. Subsequent donors feel that they are giving double.
4. Assess your need for volunteers to cover all prospects.
5. Decide on the time span to be covered.

    Start with kick-off meeting (get it donated if you can) and have report meetings.

    And remember, 15% of the people give 85% of the money.

6. Identify your top targets and get your best man to approach them. Always ask for twice what you expect and ask before December 31, for tax reasons.
7. A successful chairman should be picked a year ahead. Get five men together. Make them insiders. Sell the college plan. Ask one to be chairman. He should be the most successful man in town.

Set target dates: Start in June with plenty of time to select the right people. Choose many vice chairmen, each to have ten workers who have five prospects.

(a) The volunteer has to go and see his prospect in person.
(b) He must ask for a specific size and kind of gift.
(c) He follow through, returning if necessary.

A special gifts chairman is needed. Students can help on committees. In December, get special gifts, $500 to $10,000. Hold up the publicity until the best time. Announce the first $5000 gift at the opening of the campaign. In June, make a final effort to round up the last people and get them involved. Try to get them to donate at least $2 or $3. They may give more later. Encourage them to take part in the campaign. Offer a schedule and let the chairman adopt it. Give the chairman and workers all the credit.

Follow up: Staff should log actions and flow of gifts. Study and evaluate past campaigns: Study value of pre-campaign mailings, telephoning, etc. This will enable the next campaign to be more effective.

Get a non-alumnus to head your annual giving program. Alumni can hardly refuse him.

* * *

Steele: Vanderbilt is very big. We are small. As to input of time: you can overspend. Rural colleges have a tougher time than urban ones. At West Point, we involved our church, ran tours. This "extended family plan" really works.

Groups of colleges can unite in asking for help as Appalachia did. This is less expensive than individual effort.

There is a loyalty continuum: If you can gear your program so that students have time to earn toward their tuition, you can get more income from this source. The school must make it possible for them to earn.

Woodall: Annual giving is only 5-10 percent of our income. Long range capital gifts are more profitable proportionally. BUT it helps to say that 50% of the alumni are helping us. The best givers always want to know this.

Stockton: Sometimes annual givers give big capital gifts later.

Kelly: A warning label is needed here: Fund raising may be dangerous and habit forming.... Two-year schools can use the same methods as four-year schools.... Capital fund-raising techniques must be applied to annual giving.... The loss of junior colleges alumni does not alarm me. The same loyalty can be demanded for the two-year as for the four-year college. If they are sold on your purposes, they will help.... But loyalty is the weakest reason for asking for funds. People must be happy with the insitution to be loyal, as in family life.

Woodall: Direct mail is useful if you cannot reach people in other ways. Mailings are rather expensive and ineffective. Personal visits are eight to ten times as effective. Even the telephone is ineffective. The personal visit is the best.

Warning: Annual giving should be combined with a capital and deferred gift campaign. Its public relations value is great.

Graham: Annual giving and alumni programs are different and should be separated. New alumni have little to give. You have to cultivate them; later they may become real givers. I inherited a situation where 1200 people were solicited monthly. I cut this off. Each year I signed 500 postcards with a personal note: birthday cards without solicitation, but with an invitation to "come and see us." ...Someone who cannot give himself is not a good one to solicit others.... Past class officers are good for running a campaign. Meetings on campus are also essential. Class luncheons and reunions are excellent. In 1969, graduates of 1929, '39, '49, and '59 will return to our campus.... Class projects are good: a new gate, bell or park. The alumni come back and remember.

Woodall: This personal touch is fantastically good.

Raper: We spoke of cultivating alumni. This must start with work with students on campus. Cultivation cannot start with gift campaigns. It should start with registration.

Stockton: If we make a student's life change for the better, we will reap the results later.

Kelly: Think of fund raising as a sort of family affair. Don't always be asking for money. Don't use a gift card. Send out an information card asking for news. P.S. - a gift program. Have your first Sophomore reunion before they leave so they will get used to the idea. Have the next one a year later.

Q.: How about appeal to parents?

Schlichter (Suomi College): We lump friends and parents together. We define our role regionally. Development work is done in Lake Geneva, Wis., and Ann Arbor, Michigan. We are the Upper Great Lakes regional college (for our church).

Steele: Our college goes outside to Ohio. But our parents, at Mary Holmes, earn only about $1600 a year.

Kelly: Use alumni to help you on programs. Parents give more to private secondary schools than all other sources, and at college level, more than any other single source.

Hayes: We look at our capital program as a campaign. But we do not have annual giving because we feel time is best spent going after large donors. This is a game, for like fishermen, you have a pool of prospects never yet given a chance to give. A local campaign takes too much time from this.

Schlichter: We are rotating our resources. Don't use the same ones every year.

Kelly: Like rotating crops on a farm.

Steele: We have a ten-year development plan with price-tags assigned. We go after our prospects nation-wide through our church. We used a public relations firm to run an emergency campaign for $500,000 to keep the college open.

Woodall: Some of our big givers are now annual givers. It becomes a habit. Mr. Vanderbilt started our $55,000,000 program.

Kelly: Anything is possible if you have nerve enough to ask. One president I know, gets deferred gifts and then asks for them now and gets them.

* * *

THE CAPITAL CAMPAIGN

Dr. Walter A. Graham, President of
Southern Union State Junior College, Alabama

We raised over $500,000 for Southern Union State Junior College as a private college. But there is no fixed structure for a fund drive that will fit all colleges.

1. The first thing is, get professional help for capital campaigns. Professionals make you do things you should do but that you don't want to do. You can get someone to finance this in advance. The man who did this for us was also the biggest giver in our campaign. Shop around for a company that you think will meet your need. It will be a good investment.

2. The campaign must be understood and participated in by all from the board down, including public, staff, parents, alumni, churches, clubs, lodges.

3. You must have a brochure for foundations.

4. Don't forget the Federal Government: Our college has been turned around by our several grants and students who received loans are now some of our best contributors.

5. Have your plans all made, with specific costs, in advance. People will ask what the gift is for. Your staff must have the answers to all questions.

6. The church formula is good: A kickoff dinner, report on Wednesday, and victory dinner on Sunday.

7. Everyone should be given a job. Avoid personality conflicts and assign pledge cards carefully. Once you get a turn-down, the door is closed.

8. Keep a careful record of campaigns and changes made.

9. All participants and donors should get a full report on the outcome. The results should be diagnosed.

10. Use the right words -- "investment" and "stewardship" for example. (Stewardship: what you are doing with what you have got.)

11. How to assign amounts: Never underestimate. If you ask for $200 and you could have had $1000, you are silly.

12. Every campaigner should make his own pledge first.

13. I am against crash programs and gimmicks.

14. Enthusiasm is the secret of the whole thing. Leaders must have it as it is contagious to the others.

* * *

DISCUSSION

Tedd Kelly: You do need to have some idea of what prospects can give but don't embarrass your prospect.

Hayes: We emphasize our program. We have to sell our plans. We ask the client.

Dr. Joe Mayes: If you have a campaign goal of $500,000 -- go for three times as much. We study Dunn & Bradstreet and credit ratings to fix individual goals. Any gift of over $1000 should have a written request and special presentation. You should know your donor and his motives in giving. A well-phrased letter ten days ahead will pave the way. Asking for $100,000 will rarely offend a man.

Kelly: You need a flexible approach. Don't get locked into a fixed amount.

Mayes: You have to try to get the money where the money is. Spend extra time on big donors.

Westenberger (Martin College, Tenn.): Tax appeals seem unethical to me and unpatriotic. Maybe it is immoral to raise money at all but we have to.

Mayes: You have to know tax angles but this should not be the prime motive. Real motives for giving are primarily the same as in religious campaigns.

Raper: Maybe ministers are not cut out for raising money. It is a rough business. Dealing with contractors, you need to use the tax angle. Fundamentally people give money to people for their own satisfaction. The motives are "immortality" or "namesake." We are in our work because we feel rewarded. One of our biggest jobs is fund raising. Donor must see something in it for him. The bigger the gift, the longer it takes. The donor must be wooed.

Mayes: For big givers, four advanced "motivational mailings" should precede your request

for gifts. Big gifts take six months or more. One reason campaigns fail is, there are not enough intelligent askers. Personalized written word is still the best approach. The prospective donor will then check out the proposal with a tax advisor. Avoid negative answers and keep the door open. Return if there is hope. Otherwise, if he gives you even a small contribution, accept it with thanks.

Westenberger: Our biggest gift came from a man who talked himself into it while talking about his business success. He willed us ½ of a shopping center and gave us some cash, too.

Sneed: I know colleges that have lost $30,000 to $100,000 by hiring professional help from wrong firms. Consultants should be used to find the most suitable firm.... I organized an advisory board consisting of eleven millionaires of Oklahoma. This gave the college a base of prestige to start a campaign. One-third of the campaign will come from the top ten gifts and one-third from the next hundred. Every board member was expected to make a substantial pledge. I set a minimum for board members at $5,000. The board also helped with the work of the campaign.

Warning: Be careful of people who want to take out cards. Send out a few at a time. Note: We went to donors of the first campaign and asked ten times as much the second time. If the prospect demurred, we took the figure for last year and asked him for five times as much over a five-year period. One man gave $300 last year. We asked for $3000 but he said he couldn't give over $600. So we said, "fine, we'll take $600 a year over a five-year period."

* * *

APPROACHES TO FOUNDATIONS AND CORPORATIONS

Joe L. Hayes, Vice Pres. and Regional Manager, Southeastern Division, National Fund Raising Service, Georgia

Fund raising is not a science nor a profession. Most of the knowledge we have, we have from case histories. To motivate foundations and corporations to give money:

1. You need a person who can manage and coordinate a fine team.

2. A key person who should be consulted is an attorney.

3. You need the attorney and the CPA for the Foundation, on your side.

4. In the case of a family estate, you need the life insurance man, and the banker involved; you need the investment advisor and minister or priest.

5. Finally, you need a fund raising consultant who works with you.

There is no mysterious factor in foundations. They supply only about 8% of the money given to education.

There are some 5000 foundations in the United States. You should make many applications. Foundation program must be made part of development program. Development program aims to get maximum funds from every known source on a perpetual basis. Fund raisers can help set up meetings of bankers and businessmen to explain why education is a good investment. There is no shortage of money for your institution. But you have to bring about the processes of change -- from their bank account to yours. Put your best foot forward and approach enough people intelligently with the right materials. Always approach the director of the foundation first. All foundations are different. They are also proliferating and changing.

* * *

DISCUSSION

Graham: I agree. Specialization is important. I have tried but I have yet to get my first dollar from a foundation. Big givers have conditions attached to their gifts.

<u>Sneed</u>: Our problem is, we are junior colleges. AAJC is breaking down prejudices -- Kellogg, Carnegie, Danforth, Ford, Sloan, Sears -- but associations or groups of colleges are favored.

<u>Raper</u>: In North Carolina, all private colleges are grouped together -- junior and four-year colleges. This should be the approach to foundations by state junior college groups. My time in approaching individual donors is worth $4000 to $5000 a day.

<u>Steele</u>: Corporations offer much better sources of funds than foundations, for our colleges. I would not put together a big team to work the foundation field. I prefer to make sound proposals to business.

<u>Hayes</u>: We have 12 foundation grants this year -- EFL, NSF, Kresge, U.S.Steel, and others.

<u>Sneed</u>: I doubt that corporations would help us unless we put in programs that will benefit them. Oil company needs service station managers, etc.

<u>Resource</u>: Fund Raising Association of Plymouth, Mass., has samples of model fund raising campaigns available.

Bring business heads together in a group, get pledges and then get them to get corporations to give, too.

Once you get a gift, make it an annual gift. Then you can get other smaller corporations to give, too.

<u>Steele</u>: Corporations give because of enlightened self-interest. Private colleges can introduce programs that tie in with business and supply employment to students.

<u>Graham</u>: Property is an important source of gifts today. Donors can take tax deductions immediately. Other important sources are stocks and bonds, and living trusts.

* * *

THE PLACE AND ROLE OF THE PRIVATE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

(This dinner speech by Dr. W. Burkette Raper, President of Mount Olive Junior College, N.C., was published as an article in the <u>Junior College Journal</u> for December 1968-January 1969. See also "A Plan of Action for the Private Junior College," Dr. Raper's statement at the Montreat Conference on November 1, 1968, reprinted at the end of this monograph.)

GOVERNMENT GRANTS FOR DEVELOPING COLLEGES

Summary of discussion of the Developing Institutions Program and junior colleges by Dr. David Smith, Education Specialist, Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education

The concern of the federal government over higher education has a long history, beginning with assistance to land grant colleges early in the 1860's. Although earlier aid was given only to public institutions, government grants are now available to both public and private colleges.

The most recent legislation provides for assistance for a variety of programs directed at the institution itself, its students, faculty, administration and its curriculum. Special emphasis has been given to institutions which have not kept abreast of developments in higher education and to students whose high school education has been deficient. Another area of priority is the rapidly expanding two-year college sector with programs designed to serve the needs of every student.

In providing federal assistance to developing institutions the government has moved towards a program of general aid thereby allowing the colleges to request funds for almost any purpose other than construction and the acquisition of large amounts of equipment. The only real restriction of the use of federal funds is the limited amount which is appropriated annually by Congress. And, in view of the new priorities, this restriction requires the Office of Education to be rather selective in choosing the institutions which are to receive these funds.

Although the federal legislation makes no distinction between private and public institutions, the emphasis on priorities and the practical application of the program might create a distinction. The broad aim of government support to higher education is to provide an opportunity for every high school graduate to continue his education and to prepare himself to become a constructive member of society. In the practical application of this support, more emphasis is being given to programs directed towards the institutions providing educational services to the average, or below average, student who is not headed towards a profession and probably will not graduate from a four-year institution.

The traditional aims and objectives of the two-year liberal arts college are not broad enough to provide a service for the type of student who is the object of the current government programs. The administrators of these institutions are faced with a problem in deciding the future course of their schools. If they choose to continue to provide the best education within their means consistent with their past aims and objectives, they limit somewhat the possibility of participation in the government assistance programs.

If they choose to broaden their institutions in order to cater to the needs of the disadvantaged students, however, and develop a comprehensive program including even technical-vocational courses, they increase the possibility of receiving government assistance. This will of course alter the traditional image of their institution in some cases.

It is my impression that our officials in government recognize the value of the two-year liberal arts institutions and would not suggest that all of them be converted to comprehensive colleges. They do not suggest, either, that a liberal arts preparation is out-moded.

But they are generally agreed that the emphasis of the general program of assistance to higher education should be placed in the area of most crucial need -- that is, expanding opportunities for continuing the education of the disadvantaged student in the direction where he is most likely to fulfill his expectations and become a more useful member of American society. The limitation on the funds available does not allow the program to proceed much beyond the attack against this critical area. In a situation where more federal money is available, the needs of the private liberal arts college could be accommodated.

In a philosophical sense, the general objectives of federal aid to higher education do not exclude the private institution. In the practical application of the program, the funds are not sufficient to extend the assistance beyond the main areas of critical need.

It appears to me that the probable consequences of any attempt on the part of the administrator of the two-year liberal arts institution to receive federal assistance at this time are self-evident:

If you recognize the priorities and adjust your institution's role in that direction, you move into a position for favorable consideration.

If you do not see this direction to be consistent with the aims and objectives of your institution, then your course of action may not be inconsistent with the philosophical aims of the federal program for developing colleges, but your chance for favorable consideration will probably be less, depending on the availability of funds.

* * *

DEFERRED GIVING

William J. Sweeting, Representative,
Kennedy-Sinclaire, Inc., New Jersey

Unless you plan today for the year 2000, your doors may well close.... There is the problem of liquidity -- people want to give, but lack cash. Our emphasis is on public relations, and maximum protection for the donor's family through financial planning. We work with colleges on deferred giving programs.

Only half of the people with estates over $60,000 have wills. 80% of these are <u>direct</u> wills to wife and children.

<u>Example of Deferred Gift (bequest) Program on a $160,000 estate:</u>

Children get by straight will:	Planning program with will yields:	
	(For children)	(For college)
$121,000	$124,913	$16,000

This program won't work miracles right away. It takes time. There is no substitute for direct mail and repetition. We provide four mailing pieces a year for colleges to mail. This brings immediate gifts as well. It also sells an idea and tries to get a reaction. Living trusts and annuity programs are also good.

PART II

THE MONTREAT CONFERENCE

Assembly Inn
Montreat, North Carolina

November 1-2, 1968

Host:

Montreat-Anderson College

P R O G R A M

Private Junior College Workshop
AAJC Program With Developing Institutions
Assembly Inn, Montreat, N.C., November 1-2, 1968

Friday, November 1:

9:00 A.M.	- Opening Session. Welcome from Dean D. M. Monroe, Montreat-Anderson College, Conference Chairman; Progress of the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions - Selden Menefee, Program Director; Keynote Talk: "Planning Development Programs" - Tedd Kelly, Washington, D.C.
10:45 A.M.	- Cooperative Education - Dr. Richard Steele, Mary Holmes College; Discussion of all Federal programs
12:15 P.M.	- Luncheon speaker: Dr. C. Grier Davis, President, Montreat-Anderson College, N.C.
2:00 P.M.	- The AAJC Study of Private Junior Colleges - Dr. Kenneth MacKay, President, Union College, N.J. Panel - All consultants.
3:45 P.M.	- Long-term Development Programs (deferred gifts, living estates, etc.) - James B. Fahey of Kennedy-Sinclaire, Inc., N.J.
6:30 P.M.	- Dinner speaker: Dr. Ernest Stockton, President, Cumberland College of Tennessee
8:00 P.M.	- Film by Dr. Richard Steele on Cooperative (Experiential) Education.

Saturday, November 2:

9:00 A.M.	- Discussion of Development Programs and Annual Giving - Panel: Dr. Budd Smith, Wingate College, N.C.; Dr. Will Hayes, Alice Lloyd College, Ky.; Dr. Ernest Stockton, Cumberland College of Tennessee
10:45 A.M.	- Federal Assistance Programs - Dr. David Smith, U.S O.E.,Washington,D.C.
12:15 P.M.	- Luncheon speaker: Dr. W. Burkette Raper, President, Mount Olive College, N.C. - "A Plan of Action for the Private Junior College"

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE AAJC DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS WORKSHOP ON THE PROBLEMS OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Assembly Inn, Montreat, North Carolina, November 1-2, 1968

* * *

Consultants:

William Hayes	President, Alice Lloyd College, Ky.
Tedd Kelly	President, Educational Resources and Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.
Kenneth C. MacKay	Pres., Union College, N.J.; Director, AAJC Study of Private Junior Colleges
Selden Menefee	Director, AAJC Program With Developing Institutions, Washington, D.C.
Jack Orcutt	Administrative Assistant, AAJC-PWDI, Washington, D.C.
W. Burkette Raper	President, Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.
Budd E. Smith	President, Wingate College, N.C.
David W. Smith	Education Specialist, Div. of College Support, USOE, Washington, D.C.
Richard A. Steele	Director of Research and Development, Mary Holmes College, Miss.
Ernest L. Stockton	President, Cumberland College of Tennessee, Tenn.

College Representatives:

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College, Ga.	- Loyal V. Norman, Academic Dean
Alice Lloyd College, Ky.	- Howard G. Myers, Director of Public Relations
Anderson College, S.C.	- J. K. Lawton, Vice President
Andrew College, Ga.	- Douglas R. Barnes, Academic Dean-Registrar
Catholic U. of Puerto Rico, Ponce	- Rafael Mercado, Director of CUPR Regional Centers
Arecibo Regional Center, CUPR	- Delia M. de Mena, Director
Inter-American U. of Puerto Rico	- Ramon A. Cruz, Dean of Administration
Arecibo Regional College, IAU	- Albert A. Riddering, Director
Bayamon Regional Center, CUPR	- Rev. Vincent A.M. van Rooij, O.P., Director
Chowan College, N.C.	- Carlyle R. Wimbish, Director of Alumni Affairs
Cumberland College, Tenn.	- Ernest L. Stockton, President
Emmanuel College, Ga.	- W. G. Drum, President
	Charles E. Bradshaw, Trustee
U. of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R.	- Ethel Rios de Betancourt, Director of Academic Affairs
Humacao Regional College, UPR	- Pedro Gonzalez-Ramos, Director
Humphreys College, Calif.	- John Humphreys, President
Lees-McRae College, N.C.	- Doug Moody, Dir. of Development and Alumni Affairs
Luther Rice College, Va.	- C. L. Bishop, President
Mary Holmes College, Miss.	- Richard A. Steele, Dir. of Research and Development
Michigan Christian College, Mich.	- Joseph F. Jones; Academic Vice President
	Milton Fletcher, Vice President
Mitchell College, N.C.	- M. Kenneth Bradshaw, Dean
	Mary Edna Matheson, Bursar
Montreat-Anderson College, N.C.	- C. Grier Davis, President
	Douglas McD. Monroe, Jr., Vice Pres. & Academic Dean
	Ivan B. Stafford, Vice Pres. for Development
Mount Aloysius Junior College, Pa.	- J. Paul Melanson, Vice President
Mount Olive College, N.C.	- Austin Carter, Director of Development
	Charles H. Harrell, Business Manager-Treasurer
Norman College, Ga.	- J. Jack Bush, Dir. of Curriculum & Faculty Development
	H. Wayne Bius, Director of Development
North Greenville Junior College, S.C.	- Paul A. Talmadge, Dean of Instruction
	R. A. McKinney, Director of Alumni Relations
Peace College, N.C.	- S. David Frazier, President
	Robert P. Andress, Academic Dean
	James R. Stewart, Assistant to the President
Puerto Rico Junior College, P.R.	- Ana G. Mendez, President
	Juan M. Garcia-Passalacqua, Vice President
Reinhardt College, Ga.	- J. R. Burgess, Jr., President
	John M. Westenberger, Dir. of Public Relations & Dvlpmt.
Spartanburg Junior College, S.C.	- H. Lester Kingman, President

Union College, N.J.	- Kenneth C. MacKay, President
Wingate College, N.C.	- Budd E. Smith, President
Wood Junior College, Miss.	- Felix Sutphin, President
Young Harris College, Ga.	- Ray Farley, Dean Mrs. Charles Clegg, Dir. of Academic Aff. & Pub.Rels.

PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Talk by Tedd Kelly, President,
Consultants for Educational Resources and Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Development begins with planning .... But planning often gets shunted aside in the haste to start "bringing in the money."

Money can be raised--often substantial amounts--without prior or proper planning. But even more funds could be secured with a planned program.

Having said that, let me say that the wrong emphasis on planning can result in a hindrance to development programs. This can happen because the institution separates planning from fund raising when in reality the two functions are a continuum. In a sense, the two functions play leap frog with each other. The important point is to start with planning rather than with fund raising.

Now, what I'd like to do is to compare briefly two institutions which could be typical of those participating in the Program With Developing Institutions. We'll call one Dashforth College and the other Fordash College.

Dashforth has an enrollment of less than 200 students, most of whom commute. It is a pre-Civil War Southern institution, located in the suburbs of a major industrial center, and has strong commitment from the members of its sponsoring denomination. Fund raising activities are producing about $250,000 or more a year for budgeted annual expenditures. The staff of the college is small, but highly motivated toward the religious purposes of the college. In fact, the college is viewed by administration, faculty, students, and donors as a missionary activity of the church. There is little involvement in the community by the college, except from members of the denomination. There are no hard feelings between the two, just no communication. The future of Dashforth College is dependent upon building the enrollment. To do this more denominational students must be secured and these must come from greater distances thereby requiring resident facilities. The college's attempt to build a dormitory failed when the participation factor on a Federally financed dorm could not be secured and the Federal funds had to be returned. The need for a dormitory grows with each year, but no plans are being made to secure the funds.

Fordash College, on the other hand, has slightly more than 300 students, most of whom are resident, is also an old institution, begun more than 75 years ago, is located in a sparsely populated and economically depressed Northern area, and has sufficient denominational support to warrant calling it a church-related college. Fund-raising activities are producing less than $200,000 a year, for capital purposes. Annual giving programs have all but ceased during the capital emphasis. The administrative staff is larger than for most colleges this size. At full complement there will be three fund-raisers, an alumni man, a public relations man, and three student recruitment people, in addition to the president, dean, and business manager. The staff is loyal to the college, but their loyalty is based more upon their professional commitments than upon the religious motivations and purposes of the college. The local community, while small, is closely identified with the college because the college is a major factor in the economics of the area. Like Dashforth College, Fordash's future depends upon increasing the enrollment. Using Federal funds, several dormitories have been built and others are on the drawing boards, together with the necessary auxilliary facilities. Capital funds are being raised on a systematic basis for this purpose in larger cities some distance from the college. The growth of the college has been projected well in advance of the need so that funds can be raised to erect the facilities needed to care for the projected increases in enrollment. Personnel has been employed to get the students; personnel has been employed to get the money.

Comparing the institutions, one can see the similarities and the diversities. The major difference in the two is that Dashforth has no carefully worked out projections and Fordash has. Dashforth is living off income and Fordash is investing income in growth potential. Dashforth will continue to depend on increasing annual gifts for the college to remain viable. But substantial loss in annual income could close them. Fordash can sustain loss of annual income in order to increase the larger capital potential because even several years of deficit operation can be offset by later enrollment increases, endowment growth, and improved facilities. Furthermore, Fordash knows from its planning what variations in projected income levels occur, where they occur, and what must be done to counteract these variations in terms of present and future growth. Dashforth only knows if the budget balances or not.

To find one's college more in the category of Fordash than Dashforth, planning is the answer. Planning for development requires several elements. Different institutional problems will require different points of departure in planning, but the following items should be involved in planning:

I. Personnel. Planning begins with the president. More than anyone else, the president determines what his institution will become. I believe that every president has in mind his concept for the institution. The matter of getting this down on paper and communicating it to others may be the first problem encountered in planning. "How can we stop to plan when we're pressed for time too much now?" is the usual complaint. Be that as it may, unless the president stops long enough to think through his plans for the college and reduces these down to goals and assumptions, those who will be seeking to develop plans for the institution have little to go on and they may go in the wrong direction. The president is the architect.

The President should include in the formulation of his goals and assumptions for the college the thinking of his dean, business manager, and director of development. For it is upon these men that a large measure of the detailed planning and implementation will fall later.

The trustees of the institution should be involved in the planning and to expect them to do this requires that the Board concur in the goals and assumptions the president voices. Frequently the trustees are sympathetic, but key ones and vocal ones sometimes have to be won over and the president has his work before him here.

The faculty are indispensable in planning. Administrations sometimes find themselves planning without faculty involvement and this is as bad as teachers preparing lectures without regard to their students' interests or abilities. I have seen marvelous new facilities not used to fullest advantage because they were not built to meet the teaching needs of the faculty. Student centers may also suffer the same fate for the same reason - they were not built so as to meet student needs.

So the students should have some opportunity to participate in planning for growth. It seems to me that institutions which stress personal attention for students should have as part of their development program a means for personal expression of preference in those facilities to be used by students.

To the extent that growth will change the basic purposes of an institution, the various constituencies of the institution must be involved in some way so that communication can result and the college will not move too fast nor too slow for them. After all, these are the people you will turn to for support and their involvement will assure greater participation later. The more the change in outreach or purpose of an institution, the more important it is that the institution move carefully in keeping rapport with alumni, parents, local business concerns, its community, and its sponsoring agent.

II. Organization. The organization for planning should involve a committee representative of the above groups. The committee, which we shall call the Fordash College Development Council, should be composed of two subcommittees. The first subcommittee should be chaired by a dean or a faculty member capable of administrative responsibility, and should have as members the business manager, the dean of students, the directors of development, alumni affairs, public relations, and student recruitment, and the chaplain, if your institution has one. Also a faculty member, a member of the board, and a student representative should be on the committee. The president is an ex-officio member of each subcommittee.

The second subcommittee is actually an enlargement of the first. To the above committee is added representatives from the alumni, parents, local businesses, the community, and the sponsoring agency.

Most of the work is done by the smaller group. The larger group is mainly for review, reaction, evaluation, and suggestions. This should result in further work for the smaller group.

As the organization is set up, each group to be represented in the Development Council should represent a similar committee in his constituency. For example, the board member should be from the Board's Committee for Development, and so forth.

III. Procedure. The president and his staff should determine the need for long range planning and recommend to the Board of Trustees that long range planning be started. The Board should authorize the president to initiate planning for the college and should direct him to create a development council similar to the one above to work with him in the planning. The president would be the liaison between committee and the Board. Dates for the reporting of progress on the planning should be set by the Board. These reports are suggested: preliminary, interim, and final. The creation of a budget for this planning should be authorized by the Board.

The president should then set the committee in motion. One of their first tasks after their establishment should be to review the purposes of the college. What are the purposes of the college? Are they the same as when the college was founded? Are these purposes - whether ancient or modern - valid for today and the foreseeable future? Simply put, are you still needed?

Having gained an understanding of these purposes and given their acceptance by those groups represented on the committee, what will it take to achieve those purposes? What resources does the college have now? What resources must be developed? What are specific needs by departments, teachers, even students, which must be met? What support potential is known to exist? How much more support potential must be discovered and nurtured?

All planning should be adopted by the Board and authorization to implement the plans would come from the Board.

IV. Materials. The planning should result in several tangible, usable items. The first of these is a Sears Roebuck type of catalog of itemized statements of need--equipment, facilities, staff, enrollment, and funding. The preface of this catalog should contain an up-dated history of the college which stresses its service to others through education, a statement of purpose, and a "case for support."

A second item should be a master plan for the campus showing the physical development of the property and devising maximum use of present facilities. A good campus planner is the best investment a college can make for its development program.

The third item is a detailed timetable and plan for raising the capital expansion or endowment growth or upgrading of annual giving needed to accomplish the purposes of the development program.

And the fourth item is a package of printed materials to use in the effort to secure the funds. These are the materials for general use.

During this period of planning, the college should give attention to list-building, updating mailing procedures, and securing staff for the intensive effort. Also increased emphasis should be given to developing the gift level of donors and broadening the base of support in annual giving as a springboard into the larger fund operation.

And when the increased emphasis begins for the development program, annual giving funds should be part of a fully-integrated fund approach.

Remember that all this is a leap-frog approach. Planning is continuous; plan ahead so that when you finish your first plan, you will not come to an abrupt halt and wonder where to go next.

Development begins with planning. Development continues with planning.

DISCUSSSION

Stockton: The point about continuous planning is of great importance. We must justify ourselves continuously. We need a constant frame of reference to back up our fund drives. The goals must be picked.

Steele: We are confronting a challenge to our very existence. We need people who can think five years ahead. Our curriculum must provide a transferable product.

Hayes: Development and planning are a continuum with fund raising. We took our plan to our board and they approved it. The most important thing that I have learned is that the board must be involved. Committees must be set up and the President should stand aside and let plans develop.

MacKay: How can you strengthen your board to mount a fund-raising drive?

Kelly: You must have a working board to do this. A laymen's board is indicated, with a smaller subcommittee. Businessmen can lend you planning and research personnel. Get your local publisher on the board and get him involved. Ask him for advice and counsel for your public relations man. This will lead to financial involvement later. Involving your ministers is good for community relations.... Don't make your director of development chairman of the planning committee. Use the dean and the faculty on this.

Melanson: Foundations won't even talk to you unless you have a long range plan.... A larger advisory board should supplement the board of trustees.

Kelly: The president and the board must work together or one or the other must change. The president should never try to dictate to the board membership but he may suggest. It helps to put it on paper. Active and interested alumni and parents are good board members.

Stockton: If trustees are truly involved they will look for members to move the program forward.... "A cow will never let down her milk in response to a letter." You have to sit down with them and get them on your campus.

Joseph Jones: Assuming college presidents are great leaders, sometimes they can only see this Fall's enrollment. What can a junior administrator do to overcome this?

Kelly: One campus simply formed its own planning committee and the president (who was old and ill) stood aside. But only the board can confront a president who is not planning. "The bottleneck is always at the top of the bottle."

Steele: Kelly has given us a fine framework for planning. Which comes first - the chicken or the egg? It doesn't matter just as long as something is being done. The faculty or the board may launch the effort. At Mary Holmes College, the new president incurred a $500,000 deficit to build the college. "Do you want a college or not? You must decide," he said. He went out and got six PhD's and 27 MA's - - a fine faculty.

Dean Monroe: Good institutional research is essential as a base for good planning.

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
Talk by Dr. Richard A Steele, Director of Research and Development,
Mary Holmes College, Miss.

The cooperative education idea is about 50 years old in higher education. In 1920, Antioch adoped an alternating work and study plan for its liberal arts college. Among the junior colleges, only a few have it. Sinclair College (Dayton) has it.

The basic concept: We are in an industrial society and must be realistic. You cannot put people in an ivory tower.

Cooperative education exposes students to the outside world. This gives them interest and motivation.

You cannot get all kids to college even with scholarships. Some students have to work for family reasons and jobs are necessary. Communities are full of unfilled jobs, so students can and do work.

Cooperative education is based on an on-campus and off-campus learning situation. Counselors get him a job, visit him and talk to him to see how it is working out. When he returns to the college, he writes a paper for which he gets credit. 126 schools now do this in some form.

The first all-black college to do this was Wilberforce University and the second is Mary Holmes Junior College Other colleges are now considering it. The jobs are selected for their relationship with the college course. The student may go to New York or Hawaii for his job.

The disadvantaged have not learned to conceptualize. The work-study plan overcomes this. The students have to learn their subject. Dull students come to life after periods of work.

* * *

Q: How is cooperative education related to the work-study program on campus?

Steele: Cooperative education relieves the situation. Students in this type of program don't need campus aid as much.

Q: How do you coordinate private and public jobs?

Steele: You develop a list of contacts and make the jobs available known to the students. In the private sector, the salary is $90 and up. It is a recruiting problem. I have 950 contacts open who are asking for students. One uses 100 students. Industries send representatives to the college to interview students. They put students in charge of certain operations, under supervision. In the public sector, you solicit openings for your students.

Q: : What is the effect on retention of students?

Steele: It has a good effect. You retain student loyalties, especially since you continue to serve them even after the first two years.

Q: Do they start with college work before going on jobs?

Steele: Usually there is one semester of college study before employment.... Some now advocate the student getting a job first and adapting his education to his job needs.

Q: Would the student tend to be "weaned away" from college by outside employment?

Steele: No. They have new motivation to continue school, even to graduate. You select your students and they stick with you. If you do lose a student, it will be only to a job. You will be salvaging drop-outs.

Kelly: This plan is an integral part of the academic program. But how would you start it at Montreat-Anderson College, for instance?

Steele: First, Montreat would discuss it with other colleges. (You will find it reduces pressure on dormitory space). Then you have to convince the staff, faculty and student leaders. They must accept it. Once a decision has been made you get funds for planning.

Q: Is curriculum affected?

Steele: Yes. It becomes more relevant, more sophisticated. An accountant will find he needs computer training, for example.

Q: Are you assuming full employment? Or will the students take others' jobs?

Steele: No. None of these people replace the employed workers. They are added. Companies can and do create jobs for future leaders in their plants. They can charge it off to public relations, recruitment, etc.

Hayes: We expect 99% of our co-op students to go to New York, Washington, and other cities outside our own area.

Steele: There are 100 jobs awaiting every trained black student.

Q: Does this program affect draft deferment?

Steele: No. It is accepted as a basis for deferment; it is fully recognized as part of the college course.

Orcutt: If the student has not identified his major field of interest, what do you do? And what about employers in such cases?

Steele: You have to study each student and strengthen his weaknesses. Employers of the bigger corporations know they must seek people capable of development - not finished products.

Hayes: What did Antioch do to preserve its liberal arts approach?

Steele: You try to develop service sector jobs and an on-the-job way of life. Wilberforce requires students to take part in community affairs.

Q: Is it mainly private colleges which use the co-op plan?

Steele: Yes, but San Mateo Junior College District in California has it and some other public and junior colleges do as well. Legal changes are being made in California to remove barriers to this plan in the community colleges.

MONTREAT-ANDERSON COLLEGE: A CASE HISTORY

by Dr. C. Grier Davis, President,
Montreat-Anderson College, N.C.

In the latter part of the 19th century, an evangelical wave swept the country. A retreat was needed. Methodists and Congregationalists came to Montreat and, in 1897, a camp meeting was held here in tents. $50,000 was paid for 5000 acres by several benefactors. In 1906, it became a conference center; now it is a Presbyterian center. People came for the summer; there are 430 cottages here now.

In 1916, a normal school was started here to train mountain youth for teaching. It became a junior college, then for four years a four-year women's college; and in 1959, it became a junior college again. The board recommended that the reconstituted junior college become coeducational. When I became president in 1959, there were only 106 junior college students enrolled, and only eight of them were men. The operating deficit was $150,000 a year.

In 1961, the college employed Dr. Ivan Stafford as development officer. In 1963, a committee of six educators was chosen to consult on the future of the college, including Dr. C.C. Colvert. In 1965, they reported to the board who concurred in their recommendations. Dr. D. M. Monroe was appointed vice president of the college. He played a key part in our development, as academic dean.

In 1965, the U.S. Office of Education recognized Montreat as a developing institution. Dr. Walter Sindlinger was employed as a consultant. The morale of our faculty has soared with each consultant visit. USOE funds provided National Teaching Fellows and consultants. We have defined our purpose as serving average students. We have employed four tutors - one for each dorm.

In 1967, we launched a campaign for $2,000,000. We now have a new dormitory for women that is five stories high. Each room has a private bath. We rent thes 'ormitory rooms to summer guests for three months. A science building and library, costing $500,000 to $750,000 respectively, are started. We shall need $500,000 more to complete them.

We are deeply grateful to USOE and AAJC. We don't know what we would have done without the leadership they have supplied. Competent educators have supplied far-sighted leadership.

* * *

Dr. Ivan Stafford of Montreat-Anderson College:

How did we raise the money for our development?

(1) Our trustees were deeply involved. One of them became our president (Dr. Davis).

(2) Cottage owners of Montreat have always supported projects of our college. Significant gifts have come from and through them.

(3) Dr. Billy Graham as our neighbor and associate (and his wife, an alumna of ours) have helped us.

(4) Patrons of Montreat have helped both institutions.

(5) A wide-ranging development council of 120 people was formed. We had to renovate Montreat. The town was incorporated. Water and sewer systems were put in at a cost of $360,000.

(6) We have recently spent 90% of our time working for capital gifts. We have 37,000 on our prospect list. We have a faculty committee on development.

(7) Annual gifts are also received. The alumni are well organized.

Our capital fund campaign was the first in 50 years. It was well supported in Western North Carolina.

A STUDY OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
(An AAJC Project financed by the Sloan Foundation)
by Dr. Kenneth C. MacKay, President of Union College, New Jersey

Response to our questionnaire has been amazingly high. Administration and faculty alike cooperated in the response.

Six two-day regional meetings of about a dozen college presidents each have been held so far. We have learned that there has been a lack of communication between colleges most needing it. No one is more articulate about their faith in the future of private colleges than the presidents of these colleges.

We have 264 non-tax-supported junior colleges in the U.S. 209 are members of AAJC. 105 are independent; 68 are Roman Catholic, 20 Methodist and 12 Lutheran. The total private junior college enrollment is 143,000 compared to 1½ million in public junior colleges. Thus, the ratio is 10 to 1 for public vs. private enrollment. Private junior college faculty members number 12,000; public junior colleges, 74,000. Of the private junior colleges, 77 are women's colleges; 26 are men's colleges. (The rest are co-educational.)

The biggest concentration of private colleges is in the eastern third of the U.S. (New England, Mid-Atlantic, the South and Midwest). The trend is toward more dormitory students rather than commuters. Also, the proportion of women students is increasing.

So far 215 questionnaires have been returned; our report is due next March. Here are a few of the results:

The advantages of private colleges are seen as:
(1) Freedom
(2) Flexibility
(3) Also spiritual and moral values are stressed.

What is the chief concern of private junior colleges?
(1) Inflation, bringing intimations of mortality. MONEY. But we have to deal with this through planning.
(2) Recruitment of qualified teachers and their retention.
(3) Student unrest.
(4) Changes in curriculum: consultants are needed.
(5) Accreditation.

What are the private junior college opportunities?
(1) Quality education and letting people know about it. Many business and civic leaders have a blurred image of us. They need to get the message directly from our colleges. We can make a point of our smallness, our quality and our values.

How can AAJC help? Three ways loomed equally large to our colleges:
(1) Focus public image of the private college by press articles, etc.
(2) Federal and State Government aid are needed. AAJC was asked to help on this by the responding colleges.
(3) Foundation support: expert help is needed on this.
(4) Regional private junior college meetings (like this one).
(5) More publications about private junior colleges and their achievements. Our stockpile of case histories contains many significant innovations of interest to foundations, etc. We find cooperative programs of all types, consortia. They show initiative and imagination, and foundations endorse this.

In Conclusion: A wide spectrum of activity is needed. Many are already "with it," but some are still "academy" oriented.

Financial assistance is essential at both State and Federal levels.

A private college staff man may be needed at AAJC, as a gadfly.

The private college need not be a complete community college, but it should join all higher education in meeting as many needs as possible.

The private colleges should be aware of state master plans for higher education, and try to work with them.

* * *

DISCUSSION

Stockton: Your report shows that AAJC and USOE are moving to help the private colleges. But next year the feeling might be quite different (in Washington).

Steele: One proposal at Mary Holmes College is a new science curriculum in cooperation with Mississippi State University, (nearby), in a three year demonstration.

Budd Smith: Regional meetings have shown that enthusiasm is developing among the private colleges. We are guilty of not telling our story. But the time is coming when this will be corrected.

Will Hayes: The private, residential colleges have been almost forgotten. We must find our identity and agree on it. This year we might try to establish a group meeting with the foundations, on the basis of the MacKay report.

MacKay: In New Jersey, when the state system of junior colleges came in several years ago, there was a law already on the books allowing counties to provide scholarships in private junior colleges. This could be an example to other states.

David Smith: Amendments to the Higher Education Act are generally not oriented to help private colleges. Community colleges are helped most. But Federal assistance has helped private junior colleges in three areas: Facilities, Title III, and Libraries. Some 50% of Title III grants by number have gone to private colleges. (Four-year and two-year colleges are combined in this figure.) More should be said about the benefits of private junior colleges.

Kelly: Are private junior colleges flexible? This is secondary. The case for junior colleges must rest on the quality of classroom instruction. You can capitalize on your private status in raising funds.

Hayes: But we must define what we intend to do with our freedom and flexibility.

Steele: Cooperative education helps to involve the private sector in the junior colleges. Private colleges should capitalize on their flexibility.

Orcutt: In New York, state money, from $200 to $400 per year, under the "scholar incentive plan," goes as a direct grant to New York State residents who attend college, public or private, in the state. Private junior and senior colleges should work with public colleges in a coordinated effort to obtain state support.

Melanson: Perhaps we need a special foundation for the private junior colleges.

Hayes: There is such a foundation in North Carolina for both two and four-year colleges. We should combine our efforts to get before the business world, as they do.

Budd Smith: This presents an opportunity. We started with $10,000 our first year. Last year the combined effort in North Carolina netted $650,000 to $700,000. Of this, 60% is dvided equally among the colleges, 40% is divided by enrollment. We got $35,000 as our share last year. I worked at it for four days.

Milton Fletcher (Michigan Christian College): A private college consortium of 25 colleges is useful in Michigan.

MacKay: This sort of combined drive helps individual colleges become known, too. We use this approach in our capital drives.

J. R. Burgess, Jr. (Reinhardt College, Ga.): In Georgia, junior colleges were shut out of a combined drive. Now the four-year colleges are asking us for help for the state aid program.

J. Jack Bush (Norman College, Ga.): What implication has the open door policy for private colleges?

MacKay: Our ability to selcet students gives us a certain freedom to develop innovations. We don't have to be "little Harvards." We can work with special groups of disadvantaged, as well as with ordinary students.

Budd Smith: I meet monthly with the presidents of all campus student groups. They agreed that the quality of teaching depends on the teacher's understanding of what the purpose of the college is. Students feel that transfer should not be the main purpose of the junior college. The faculty, too often, think it is.

LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS -- DEFERRED GIFTS, LIVING ESTATES

Talk by James B. Fahey, Planned Gifts Department,
Kennedy-Sinclaire, Inc., Montclair, New Jersey

The need for immediate gifts to meet capital and operating needs often diverts junior college administrators from the quest for the more complex deferred gift. This fact is true in spite of the fact that deferred gifts are far larger in size, generally, than the average immediate or "pledged" gift. In 1967, six of the ten largest gifts made by Americans to educational and charitable organizations were made in the form of bequests. Another of the ten largest gifts took the form of a living trust.

Income to a junior college from deferred gifts can be compared to water supply at the kitchen tap. Many of our older educational institutions enjoy a steady stream of income from the tap because the reservoir (of bequest expectancies, living and testamentary trusts, etc.) has been carefully filled. We might ask ourselves whether we are trying to fill the reservoirs of our own colleges so that five or ten years from now our faucet will provide us with a steady stream, rather than an intermittent drip.

Factors Affecting Giving:

1. Growth of personal income -- There are several economic factors which indicate that all forms of giving, including bequests and other types of deferred gifts, will increase in the future.

One of the important factors which will increase future educational income is the continued growth of personal income. Between 1950 and 1966, personal income rose from $226.2 billion to $575.9 billion, a rise of 154% in 16 years! Preliminary analysis indicates that personal income for 1967 was not less than $620 billion.

While 969,000 individuals reported $15,000 or more income in 1950, 4,248,000 reported such income in 1965. This represented an increase from 1.9% of all income tax returns filed, to 6.3%. This area represents the prime market of those individuals having discretionary income -- that is, income over and above that needed to pay necessary bills and put away a small amount for savings. These are persons in a position to make a contribution to higher education.

2. Increase in federal estate tax returns -- More specifically important to the deferred giving field is the increase in federal estate tax returns filed. Since an estate tax return is required only on estates of $60,000 or more, the continued rise of estate tax returns will certainly have a favorable affect on deferred giving.

In 1945, 15,900 federal estate tax returns were filed transferring property worth $3.4 billion. The number of returns and their value has risen steadily in the years since.

In the latest year for which Internal Revenue Service figures are available (1965), 94,000 returns were filed with a value of $20.7 billion, about a six-fold increase in both categories. This category of wealth has increased at a much faster rate than even personal income. Since estates of $60,000 or more are subject to federal estate tax, this figure is highly significant.

Your Need Versus the Prospect's Need:

With these figures in mind, it might be natural for the administrator or development officer to ask, "Why are we not getting more of this bequest money? Certainly we try hard

enough to publicize our needs. We try to make personal calls on wealthy individuals to outline our needs more thoroughly. Where are we failing?"

We might suggest that the problem lies in a failure to consider the prospect's own needs. We may be so wrapped up in our institution's imaginative projects and building needs that we often fail to see the prospect's point of view.

1. Conflict Inhibiting Charitable Giving -- No matter how well we may be able to motivate a prospect, the fact remains that his responsibilities to his own family will be foremost in his own thinking. It is important that the development officer realize this when helping a prospect plan a substantial gift. We must resolve the conflict between the prospect's charitable impulse and his need to protect his family.

2. Contradictory Action - Financial Loss -- Even the wealthiest and most sophisticated donors are usually unaware of the best methods of protecting their families after their deaths. Newspaper articles often tell us about the erosion of multi-million dollar estates by taxes and costs. Many are shocked to hear that seven out of eight adult Americans do not have wills. Certainly no benefit to education can be expected from the estates of this great majority. Even more important to those interested in deferred fund raising is the fact that 50 percent of those Americans with estates large enough to be subject to federal estate taxes do not have wills. Eight out of ten American husbands who make a will try to protect wives and children by leaving their entire estate outright to their wives. This method can be in direct opposition to the aims they are attempting to accomplish.

Illustration of Deferred Gift

1. Let's see how this outright distribution can erode the value of a man's estate through costs and taxes.

a. Suppose that Mr. Jones has a gross estate of $250,000 left outright to his widow, with the expectation that she will live on the income from this sum and, by her own will, transfer it to their children.

b. Estate settlement costs will be the first erosion factor in Mr. Jones' estate. In a nationwide survey of costs, the national average was determined to be eight percent. If this figure is applied to Mr. Jones' estate, costs will amount to $20,000, leaving an adjusted gross estate of $230,000.

c. The marital deduction feature of our estate tax law allows for a transfer of up to one-half of the adjusted gross estate tax free to the surviving spouse. Mrs. Jones would thus receive $115,000 of her husband's estate tax free.

d. Taxes amounting to $8,250 would be payable on the other half of Mr. Jones' estate.

e. The net result of these taxes and costs is that Mrs. Jones will be living on the income, not from $250,000, but only $221,750.

f. The most shattering influence will be on the second transfer - from Mrs. Jones to her children. Assuming that Mrs. Jones is able to live on the income from her capital of $221,750 for a period of ten or fifteen years and is able to will the entire capital to her children, at her death, costs of eight percent or $17,740 would be incurred.

2. a. Suppose that you, as a college development officer, are in a position to educate the many Mr. Joneses on our prospect list to a method of distribution which will conserve a far greater share of their assets for their children. Would he not be better disposed to making a gift to your school?

b. Here is a method which can easily be incorporated in a will to provide this conservation for the children:

Mr. Jones' $250,000 estate still encounters costs of eight percent or $20,000. Mr. Jones still takes advantage of the marital deduction to leave Mrs. Jones $115,000 tax free.

c. The taxable portion of the estate, however, is placed in trust for the Jones children with income payable for life to Mrs. Jones.

d. Under this method, Mrs. Jones would still have the income from $221,750.

e. At Mrs. Jones' death, however, the trust (value after taxes $106,750) would be distributed to the children without the deduction of further costs and taxes.

f. Mrs. Jones' estate of $115,000 would bear costs of $9,200 and taxes of $6,076.

g. The ultimate distribution to the Jones children would be $206,474. An increase of $36,000 over Mr. Jones' outright distribution plan.

While this result can easily be effected by an attorney, 80 percent of American wills call for outright distribution to the surviving spouse.

3. Planned Giving -- If we assume that Mr. Jones is one of your well motivated alumni, he would certainly be interested in a method of distribution which would allow him to make a gift to your institution, while providing his wife with greater income. He can do this in the following manner:

The $250,000 gross Jones estate will pay costs of $20,000. Again taking advantage of the marital deduction, Mr. Jones leaves $115,000, tax free to Mrs. Jones.

The terms of Mr. Jones' will create a trust for the benefit of the Jones children in the same manner as we showed in our previous example - but with an important difference.

In this example, Mr. Jones includes a gift of $25,000 to your institution as a part of the trust. The estate obtains a charitable deduction for this gift which has the effect of cutting the estate tax almost in half (from $8,250 to $4,232).

Mrs. Jones will then derive an annual income from $225,768, rather than $221,750, as would have been the case if the gift had not been made.

At Mrs. Jones' death, the $25,000 gift would be distributed to your college. The balance of the trust would be paid to the Jones children.

Mrs. Jones' own estate, consisting of the $115,000 inherited outright from her husband, would incur costs of $9,200 and taxes of $6,076. The Jones' children would receive a total of $185,492.

To sum up the results of a planned gift in Mr. Jones' estate, assuming that his original plan called for outright distribution to his wife:

1. Mrs. Jones would have increased income during every year of her widowhood.

2. The Jones children would share $15,000 more from their mother's estate.

3. Your college would receive a gift of $25,000.

Illustration of Living Trust AND Deferred Gift

1. a. Let's take the case of a wealthy retired farmer by the name of Davis. He and his wife are both 65 years of age. They enjoy a substantial income of $35,000, principally from the profit on farm acreage which is now managed for them by others.

b. The Davises are entitled to double income tax exemptions since they are 65 years of age. The total of their two double exemptions is $2,400. They have itemized deductions of $3,500.

On the basis of these tax factors, Davis would pay a yearly income tax of $7,529 and have disposable income of $27,471.

c. Mr. Davis has been pondering a decision lately. One small parcel of his land has not been very profitable. He paid $10,000 for this small farm during World War II, and in recent years it has been returning about $1,000 to him after expenses were paid. Based on his original investment, Davis, for many years, considered this a satisfactory return of ten percent.

Recently Davis has had inquiries about his land by large scale real estate developers. He has found, after consultation with several brokers, that this land is worth $50,000! Based on current market value, his yield is not ten percent, but merely two percent.

d. After further consultation with his attorney and his accountant, he learned that his investment yield could easily be doubled if $50,000 were invested in high grade bonds with negligible risk to his investment.

One drawback Mr. Davis' accountant pointed out was that a considerable capital gain tax would have to be paid on his $40,000 gain on the sale. This would mean that he would have far less than $50,000 left to invest after the deal was closed.

The accountant suggested that Mr. Davis pay a visit to the development director of the nearby agricultural college and find out what suggestions he could make. Davis had benefited often in the past from information he had received from the college. He usually made a generous annual gift to the school and was acquainted with the development officer.

2. a. The development officer showed him some charts which pointed out how he could have more income for himself WHILE MAKING A GIFT TO THE COLLEGE.

b. He first pointed out to Davis that the college was a tax-exempt institution not subject to the payment of capital gains or income taxes.

c. He further pointed out that a gift in trust to a college qualifies for an immediate tax deduction EVEN THOUGH THE DONOR RESERVES THE INCOME TO HIMSELF AND HIS WIFE (of about $28,000).

d. The process, in Davis' case, would work this way:

1. Davis would make the college trustee of his land with the right to all income from it during his lifetime. His wife would continue to receive the income if she survives him.

2. The college would sell the property, without capital gains tax liability, and reinvest the proceeds.

3. The development officer estimated conservatively that a return of $2,000 (4%) could be obtained by the college.

4. The development officer pointed out that the $28,500 income tax deduction would exceed the limitation of 30% of income allowed for one tax year, but that the excess could be carried forward and applied to taxes for an additional tax year.

e. Here is the effect on Davis' income in the year in which the gift is made:

1. Gross income is still $35,000.

2. His exemptions still total $2,400, other deductions (exclusive of charitable gifts) total $3,500.

3. He has an additional deduction of $10,500 (30% of his gross income).

4. Davis' tax is reduced from $7,529 to $3,988.

5. His actual after tax income is increased from $27,471 to $31,012.

f. The benefits to Davis ARE INCREASED IN THE YEAR AFTER THE GIFT IS MADE.

1. Because of the reinvestment by the college, his gross income increases to $36,000.

2. Maximum carry forward of $10,500 is applied, together with exemptions and deductions, to this income.

3. As a result, Davis' after tax income is even higher, at $31,760, than in the year the gift was made.

g. In the following year Davis uses up the remainder of his charitable deduction ($7,569).

1. His after tax income is $30,842 - $3,400 higher than it had been before he made the gift.

h. Assuming that Davis lives for another ten years, his disposable income each year -- even after the tax deduction for his gift in trust has been fully exhausted -- is $28,120 per year. This amounts to $649 extra money per year for him to dispose of as he desires.

3. As if the income tax advantages were not sufficient, the development officer points out to Davis that the same gift will provide estate tax advantages as well.

a. Davis estimates his assets to be presently worth about a half million dollars. His will calls for outright bequest to his wife.

b. The development officer points out the tax effect of his present estate plan if the gift is not made.

1. Cost of estate settlement, including court costs, executors and attorneys fees, etc. average, nationally about eight percent. Using the average Davis' estate would incur costs of $40,000 leaving $460,000 taxable.

2. Federal estate tax regulations permit one-half of an estate to pass tax free to a surviving spouse completely free of tax, regardless of the size of the estate. Mrs. Davis would receive $230,000 under this provision. The other half of the estate would be subject to a tax of $41,700.

3. Mrs. Davis would receive, after costs and taxes, $418,300. Assuming that she lives on the income from this sum for the next ten years and then dies, willing her estate to her children, the following would take place.

4. Costs would reduce Mrs. Davis' estate by $33,464. Since no special tax deduction is available for a transfer between mother and children, as with husband and wife, the full impact of the Federal estate tax is absorbed by Mrs. Davis' estate. HER ESTATE WOULD PAY A TAX OF $89,648.

5. The end result would be that the Davis children would receive only $295,000 from their father's $500,000 estate -- ASSUMING THAT MRS. DAVIS DOES NOT SPEND ONE CENT OF THE PRINCIPAL DURING HER LIFETIME. She lives on the income alone.

4. The development officer proceeds to show Mr. Davis how a living trust of $50,000, together with a testamentary trust in the children's favor can cut taxes and costs considerably.

a. The first effect of the trust gift is to reduce costs, since it is not part of the "probate" estate. Costs would be $36,000 rather than $40,000.

b. The half of the estate passing tax free to Mrs. Davis would be increased by $2,000 to $232,000, because of the reduction in costs.

c. An estate tax deduction (in addition to the income tax deduction previously enjoyed) would be allowed for the living trust. Assuming Mrs. Davis is 78 years of age upon her husband's death, this deduction would amount to over $40,000. Taxes would be reduced from $41,700 in the taxable half of the estate to $30,101.

d. This half of the estate would not, however, be left directly to Mrs. Davis. It would be placed into a trust which would come into being upon Mr. Davis' death. The trust would pay its income to Mrs. Davis during the remainder of her life. Following her death it will be distributed to the Davis children -- COMPLETELY FREE OF FURTHER TAXES OF COSTS.

e. Mrs. Davis would have more income during her lifetime, from $232,000 received outright, plus $151,899 in testamentary trust and income from the $50,000 living trust. She receives income from a total of $433,899 as compared with $418,300 if Mr. Davis had left his entire estate outright to her with no gift to the college.

f. At the later death of Mrs. Davis, her estate would consist of a total of $232,000 less costs of $18,560 and taxes of $36,732. The net amount would go to the children. In addition, they would receive the proceeds of the testamentary trust, $151,899 or a total of $328,607, about $33,000 more than they would have received under their father's former plan without the gift in trust.

5. To recap the income tax results of Davis' $50,000 gift in trust:

a. He would escape taxation on a $40,000 capital gain.

b. He would have an increase in disposable income in the year of the gift of $3,541.

c. He would have an increase in disposable income in the first year after the gift of $4,289.

d. Increase in disposable income in second year after the gift of $3,371.

e. Increase in disposable income for the next ten years -- $6,490.

This represents a total increase in disposable income of $17,691.

6. A recap of the <u>estate</u> tax advantages reveals that:

a. Mrs. Davis will have more than $25,000 of additional capital working for her during her widowhood.

b. The Davis children will receive $33,419 more than they would have if Davis had stuck to his former plan.

7. Mr. Davis' gift and planning result in:

   a. Total tax savings to his family of $51.110 and

   b. A generous gift to education of $50.000.

While Mr. Davis is a fictional person, the principals involved bear a strong resemblance to those involved in a $15 million dollar gift to the University of Rochester about a year ago. In that case, the gift was one of highly appreciated stock, rather than farm land.

These are only two methods by which a person may accomplish these objectives. There are literally dozens of provisions of both the Federal Income Tax and Estate Laws which have been written by Congress to encourage giving to higher education. By awareness to these opportunities, it will often be possible for you, the college president or administrator, to be as responsive to your prospect's needs as you are to your institution's needs.

The ground work for a solid deferred giving program laid today can assure you that your school will be enjoying income from it in the years to come. By starting now, you can provide for a better future - for both your institution and your prospect.

.... These methods are not loopholes, but incentives to increase gifts to private education. The average college president or development officer can use these methods to stimulate giving. Memorials are also useful: A dramatic chair or library addition can also help to motivate giving. But the desire to give must be there first.

A third major plan is annuities (guaranteed income) from gifts. All of these methods have their places in a long-term development program.

* * *

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND ANNUAL GIVING
by the Panel

Dr. Ernest Stockton:

Many colleges have felt unable to work with alumni extensively because of lack of staff, a belief that two-year colleges don't have the alumni loyalty, etc. But our experience is encouraging.

We set up a program for alumni giving and a prospect list and goals. We try to get a matching gift commitment. We have a top-flight man in charge of the drive. Quotas are set from $100 to $1000 special gifts (10% of the total).

We have a vice-chairman for each ten workers. Each worker has five prospects. Each prospect is asked for twice what he would probably give and an attempt is made to get something from each prospect. December 31 is the deadline for tax purposes, so the drive may be finished on that date.

Then follows an evaluation and planning begins for next year.

Dr. Will Hayes:

Presidents need to identify their colleges' service to society and the most urgent priorities of our society. Only then can they articulate the meaningful identity of our colleges, particularly the private colleges.

As to support for this idealism, there are no "reluctant" donors -- rather a pool of potential supporters who have not yet been challenged with the satisfactions of investing in important idealisms. A president has the privilege to welcome participants in this effort.

Alice Lloyd College had an operating budget of $100,000 in 1961; faculty salaries were almost nonexistent; physical plant primitive. But the college's mission was important. Students with family incomes less than ordinary cost of college for one student, were educated for leadership in up-building the region. Ninety-five percent of ALC graduates have continued to senior college and 90% returned to service positions in the professions. Since then, annual gift investment has increased by 3½ to 4 times. We have shown the large society what our priorities are. If they don't have reason to invest, we cannot succeed, we must reassess our role constantly. ALC has spent $500,000 in faculty and student housing since 1961. Other improvements have been provided. An estate planning program is in operation.

A college president must:

(1) Develop initiative and a program to serve community and nation.

(2) Tell all about the college's plans and ambitions.

(3) Not jeopardize the development program by putting the $ sign on top of it.

It is important to tell people about your program rather than ask for dollars. ALC involved outstanding educators in planning the institution in relation to the society. We built our program around the needs and lives of students.

It was through the involvement of top people that we applied and received $242,000 in Appalachian funds for our science building. This resulted from imaginative educational planning. Our science building plans drew Educational Facilities Laboratories' attention. Five foundations became interested and made grants ranging from $10,000 to $15,000, matching Title I and Appalachian Funds.

Seven years ago, Conser, Gerber, Tinker and Stuhr were selected for consultation. Dr. Robert Tinker still consults with us. He says, "First build your institution and your faculty and make them good. The development program is a point of view: the highest destiny of your institution. You need to serve your students, society's most urgent priorities."

Dr. Budd Smith:

In 1953 I went to Wingate, with little knowledge about it. The campus was valued then at $250,00 and was heavily mortgaged. The academic dean said that only 19 students were registered for the Fall semester. The faculty was threatening not to return. (The top salary was $2800 the preceding year.) The business office presented me with $17,000 in bills held over from the last year. We had $6.48 in the bank. (The audit hadn't shown this.)

We dug in. At first we had to depend on annual giving. On the board of trustees, 18 out of the 24 members were ministers. (Few ministers should be on the board if you are after money.) Our executive committee met and planned a drive. $10,000 was borrowed on a personal note signed by my wife and me and by a businessman on the board.

We let our imagination run wild. An enthusiastic faculty helped. In 1965, we were offered a challenge gift of $100,000. Our trustees became involved in trying to find money to match it. They collected $39,000 against the $100,000, and were ready to quit. Then I talked to them, with the result that one trustee pledged $5,000, others followed and boosted the fund to $65,000. This put us on our way.

Our expansion program had started in 1957. Our campus is now worth $10,000,000, with only $450,000 in debts.

The secret was the challenge, and trustees who were willing to work. The trustees organized a patrons' club in 1961. The members had to invest a minimum of $100 a year. Last year we had 350 patrons and they gave $172,000 for the operational costs of the college. They have one meeting a year, at which they pick the "Patron of the Year."

The total college family must be involved in annual giving.

In 1963, the trustees founded an advisory council of 28 members. This opened our Baptist college to all elements of the community.

Our budget this year is $2,000,000. We get $175,000 a year from annual giving. The Baptist community is important. Our entire college family is, too. We also work closely with the Chamber of Commerce. Each year they set aside a day for "Wingate College Appreciation Day." Our bread and butter lies with the commuting students, so this helps. Wingate cannot take any Federal funds except for scholarships and faculty fellowships.

So we have to raise funds from other sources. To repeat: Everyone must become involved, especially the faculty and students.

* * *

COMMENTS

Kelly: Annual and capital gift techniques are identical. Note: Mailings were not mentioned by Dr. Stockton. You can use mailings, but it is better to see the individual. People must be personally involved first, to want to give.

Steele: Some schools do not have ready-made constituencies. We hit upon a patron or "extended family" concept at Mary Holmes. We organized educational tours to our campus from northern churches. We simply told them we could use some money, at the end of the tour, and they contributed.

Mailing was a total "bust" with us ... The results were zero.

Stockton: I agree. Without the personal contact, mailings are unproductive.

Hayes: Here are three tips:

(1) Do you have vacancies on your board?

(2) Your excellence is not measured by being the "Harvard of the West." Our excellence must be measured against our local needs.

(3) Get off your seat and go talk to people. Get them to invest in idealism.

Raper: Two magic words in fund-raising are "investment" and "development." Appeals should not stress administration and faculty salaries.... Use a total program for development of facilities and instruction. The key in the future will be long-range planning and deferred gifts. We need to put the whole thing together in a package.

Budd Smith: Participation is the key word ... by everyone.

* * *

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(Editor's Note: Dr. David Smith's presentation at Montreat covered substantially the same ground as his earlier statement at Lebanon. See pages 16-17 for this statement.)

A PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE*

by W. Burkette Raper, President, Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.
(Excerpts from an address delivered to the AAJC Private Junior College Workshop in Montreat, N.C., November 2, 1968)

What was foreseen a decade ago by educational forecasters is now taking place: private higher education is fighting for its life and some colleges are not going to survive.

Some time ago a leading businessman in our community was giving a day of his time to accompany me in making some fund-raising calls for Mount Olive College. As we drove to a neighboring city, I commented to him that many private colleges were in trouble, and I cited the report of William G. Bowen, provost of Princeton University, which predicts that by 1975-76 a typical private university will have an operating deficit of between $20 million and $28 million.

In our own case, I said, we face a new situation with the opening of two public community colleges within thirty miles of our campus which day students can attend for approximately one-fourth of the cost at Mount Olive College.

"What do you think is the answer for Mount Olive College?" he asked.

If you were to ask the presidents of private colleges what they considered their most critical need, the most frequent answer would probably be "money" -
money for faculty salaries,
money for needed administrative help,
money for buildings,
money for scholarships, and
money, just plain money and plenty of it.

I dare say, however, that money is not our basic problem but is rather a symptom of our problem. The late Dr. Hollis Edens, former executive director of the Babcock Foundation, told me the experience of a philanthropist who was visiting various colleges which had applied for a grant. He came late one afternoon to a campus where he greeted the president with these words:

> "I've seen all the real estate I want to see and I've climbed all the steps I care to climb, but if you have anyone here with ideas, I'll listen to him."

The United States is the wealthiest nation on earth, the American people are the most generous in the world, and education is our most important business. I believe that there is money available for those colleges which will adequately meet the needs of their students, who will properly serve their churches and communities, and who have good administrative leadership.

The time has come when we in the church-related colleges must build our cases not upon the beautiful statements in our catalogues but upon what we are doing to provide viable and relevant educational services in a society which is undergoing a technical, social, religious and political revolution.

Let us consider a plan of action for our two-year private colleges.

I. Services to our Students

It was higher education which provided the stimulus for the changes which brought on the revolution in which we live, but higher education itself has become highly resistant to change. Nowhere is this resistance more likely to prevail than in many church-related liberal arts colleges.

In too many cases we are trying to prepare people to live in a world which no longer exists.

A fundamental question many of us need to ask ourselves is, "Are we willing for our college to truly become student centered rather than curriculum centered?" Are we willing to design our programs to meet the realistic needs of our students rather than putting our greatest emphasis upon preparing students for future courses in which most of them will never enroll?

By its very nature, the two-year college has a transfer function, and it should seek to perform this function in the best manner possible, but have we taken an honest look at the fact that perhaps most of our students do not transfer? Those students whose formal education will end on our campus are also entitled to appropriate and beneficial educational experiences. These are our students, too.

Proper attention to this problem might greatly reduce the attrition which many of us face. Dr. Joseph Froomkin, Assistant Education Commissioner for Program Planning in Evaluation, USOE, from his research reports:

"At least half of the dropouts 'from college' ... are caused by unsuitable programs, not by financial or academic difficulties."

Another change which the church-related junior college must recognize is the wider range of students who are now continuing their education beyond high school. Let's be realistic, most of us cannot afford to be highly selective in our admission standards, nor should we, in my opinion. In an address at Mount Olive College, Dr. Louis Shores, long-time librarian at Florida State University, spoke to this point in these words:

"Those colleges which seek to educate only the top ten per cent are cowards. Anybody can educate these. The real challenge is to educate the other ninety per cent."

And why not? I might add. These are God's children, too. As much as it may injure our pride, we must be willing to admit the students available to us; we must teach the students we have, not those we might wish we had; and we must start with them where they are.

There are few things more contemptible than a college which is struggling for survival, trying to identify itself as a seat of higher learning for the academic elite. Excellence in education does not require being exclusive in admissions, classical in our curriculum, and unrealistic in our grading. True excellence, in my opinion, is taking a student where he is and inspiring him to achieve at his highest level. The superior teacher is one who can present his subject matter at a level to be understood and in a manner that motivates the student to learn.

Professor Benjamin Bloom of the University of Chicago has experimented with various methods of teaching, and out of these experiments writes:

"Most students (perhaps over 90 per cent) can master what we have to teach them, and it is the task of instruction to find the means which will enable our students to master the subject under consideration. Our basic task is to determine what we mean by mastery of the subject and to search for the methods and materials which will enable the largest proportion of our students to attain such mastery."

I can see a need and a future for colleges which are willing to measure excellence not in terms of how exclusive they are but rather in terms of how helpful they are. George Washington Carver expressed this truth when he said:

"Measure me not by the heights to which I have climbed, but by the depths from which I have come."

Underlying these questions of curriculum and philosophy of teaching is whether or not we are student centered or institution centered colleges. There are different features by

which colleges are distinguished:

> admission standards, specialized programs, endowments, athletic achievements, the quality of social and cultural life which characterizes their students, and the grandeur of their campuses.

These qualities are honorable, but "developing junior colleges" will probably never achieve their fame through any of them. I believe that colleges like ours can make their greatest contribution to students and best achieve their distinction as educational institutions by being colleges which care most for our students. The final standard of judgment for a college is not the number of its buildings,

> ... not the size of its budget,
> ... not solely the degrees of its faculty.

What is most important is the contribution which the college makes to the lives of its students. Apart from this function nothing else is really important. We may be limited in many ways, but we can be colleges which really care, and this care can be translated into action.

One of the greatest impacts the technological and social revolution of our times has made upon us is to create a society in which people feel lonely, unwanted, and uprooted, and much of the unrest on campuses throughout the nation stems from these feelings. The private junior college is uniquely prepared to speak to these needs if it will take advantage of its small size and foster a meaningful relationship between students and faculty. We can be the kind of colleges Gilbert Highet had in mind when he wrote in -

> The Art of Teaching:
>
> "Pupils should feel that the teacher wants to help them, wants them to improve, is interested in their growth, is sorry for their mistakes and pleased by their successes and sympathetic with their inadequacies."

What we are going to do about the crises which face private junior colleges? In our services to students we can be student-centered colleges:

> we can adjust our curriculum and teaching methods to meet the needs of the students have;
>
> we can be realistic in our concept of those whom we will serve; and
>
> we can be the colleges which really care about students as individuals, as persons.

Colleges which are concerned about their finances have all the more reason to take special care of their students; they are our major source of income.

II. Services to our Churches and Communities

Next to students, gifts constitute the major financial resource for most private junior colleges, and it is to our advantage that we are dependent upon voluntary support for our survival; otherwise, we could become very independent and even indifferent toward those whom we were called into being to serve. One reason the public two-year colleges are so responsive to the educational needs of their communities is that they are fully dependent upon the will of the people for tax levies and bond issues. It may be that the crises which confront our private colleges will bring us close to those upon whom we depend for survival.

Those of us who are in church-related colleges can no longer afford the luxury of defining some narrow phase of knowledge, such as the liberal arts, and concluding that our

duty is ended when we provide such education to a carefully selected and limited number of students. Nor can we any longer rest on the archaic concept that our only function is to teach young people between the ages of 18 and 22, nor that the day of instruction begins at 8:00 A.M. and ends at 3:00 P.M.

The burden of proof is now on us to convince the church, individuals and business firms that we are providing for them any kind of distinctive service which merits their support. The fact that we need money is not adequate; poverty is a weak calling card when you are seeking funds. People do not support colleges because they need money, but because they benefit from and believe in the services which they are rendering.

A. What Can A Church-Related College Do for Its Sponsoring Constituency?

1. It can make an unapologetic Christian commitment, and it can translate this commitment into its total program and policies. In my opinion, the most effective step is in the kind of faculty members, administrative officers and personnel who are appointed. I am not proposing narrow sectarianism nor denominational exclusiveness, but unless the church-related college can provide a religious dimension of education not available in the public colleges, it can hardly justify its appeal for general support from a church body. The quality of education I have reference to is not obtrusive, but rather pervasive.

Church-related colleges were founded by people who believe in God and they are supported by these people in order that young people may have an opportunity to live and learn in an academic community which upholds the highest ethical and moral principles known to man. To foster a love for God can be one of the distinctive features of a church-related college. If a college is church-related in name only, why should a church body support it?

2. The Church-related college can provide special services to its sponsoring church. The church has just as much right to look to its colleges for services as a community has to look to a public college to meet its educational need. Not only should the church-related college provide basic education for young men and women who may enter the professions or prepare for certain vocations, but it should serve the church at large. Off-campus courses, non-credit courses in response to known needs, youth activities, institutes for laymen and ministers, speakers bureau for special programs are only a few of the possibilities open to the private college.

North Carolina State University is currently training approximately 14,000 people a year in 200 on-campus short courses and conferences. This function of a land-grant college is an effort, in the words of President Charles R. Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin, to serve "all of its sons and daughters." The commitment of the church-related college to serve its constituency should be no less than the commitment of the public college to serve its district or state. No other agency is better prepared to serve the broad educational needs of the church than are its colleges.

It is my opinion that the better the college serves the church, the more the church will support the college.

B. How Can a Church-Related College Serve Its Community?

To the degree that a college wants financial support from a community it must orient itself to serve the community. One of the major concerns of each college I have visited under the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions has been its relationship with its community. Except for highly expensive vocational and technical programs, a private junior college should be able to render any service to its community that a public college renders.

Some opportunities for community service include:

1. Recruitment of day students
2. Free auditing privileges for local citizens
3. Night classes on both a credit and non-credit basis

4. Open invitation to the public to concerts and lectures
5. Speakers bureau of both students and faculty for various kinds of programs
6. Free use of college facilities for community groups
7. Library privileges
8. Encouragement of college personnel to participate in community events and to serve on local committees, and
9. Active participation in the Ministers Association, civic clubs, business and community organizations, and school activities.

In addition to these services and involvement in community life by the college, the community should be brought into the life of the college. Where possible, local citizens should be included on the governing board of the college, and where this provision is impossible, advisory committees and area foundations should be considered.

If a college wishes to receive meaningful voluntary support from local citizens, the community must feel that it is a part of the college family. Nothing can give a community greater pride than having a college in its midst, but this pride exists only when the citizens feel that the college is <u>their</u> college.

In conclusion: I have suggested a 4-fold plan of action --

1. Improvement of services to our students:
   - that we be student centered, rather than curriculum or institution centered colleges;
   - that we take advantage of our small size to develop a meaningful relationship between students and teachers;
   - that we emphasize the human quality of education, a concern for people;
   - that we prepare students for life as it is, not as it has been and not as we might wish to be.

2. That the church-related college provide a Christian dimension to its total educational program which is not possible in the public colleges.

3. That we broaden our educational services to our churches.

4. That we serve our communities, become a part of the community and let the community become a part of us.

It is these services which will provide the most effective cultivation for our fund-raising effort and which will give meaning to our long-range planning.

The Developing Institutions Program of the U.S. Government (under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965) is one of the most constructive and enlightened of all the Federal programs of aid to education, but this program can help only those colleges which are willing to <u>change</u> and <u>serve</u>. which have good leadership, men with ideas.

PART III

APPENDICES

A. THE LEBANON CONFERENCE
September 27-28, 1968

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Member and Associate Colleges participating:

1. Alice Lloyd College, Ky.
2. Aquinas Junior College, Tenn.
3. Cumberland College, Tenn.
4. Freed-Hardeman College, Tenn.
5. Hiwassee College, Tenn.
6. Lees Junior College, Ky.
7. Martin College, Tenn.
8. Mary Holmes College, Miss.
9. Mercy Junior College, Mo.
10. Morristown College, Tenn.
11. Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.
12. Ottumwa Heights College, Ia.
13. Sacred Heart College, Ala.
14. Saint Catharine College, Ky.
15. St. Gregory's College, Okla.
16. Southeastern Christian College, Ky.
17. Southern Baptist College, Ark.
18. Southern Union State Junior College, Ala.
19. Suomi College, Mich.
20. York College, Nebr.

II. Consultants:

1. Walter A. Graham, Ala.
2. Tedd Kelly, Washington, D.C.
3. Selden Menefee, AAJC, Washington, D.C.
4. W. Burkette Raper, N.C.
5. David W. Smith, USOE, Washington, D.C.
6. Richard Sneed, Okla.
7. Richard A. Steele, Miss.
8. Joe L. Mayes, Ga.
9. William J.Sweeting, N.J.
10. David Woodall, Tenn.

III. Workshop Evaluations on a five-point scale (32 returns):

(1) Highest (very valuable)	29
(2) Second highest (considerable value)	3
(None lower)	

IV. Agenda Sessions' Value (In order of importance):

(All with panel discussions)	(First)	(Second)	(Third)
1. Long-range Planning, etc. (Kelly)	10	12	3
2. Alumni and Annual-giving Programs (Woodall)	0	3	4
3. Capital Campaign (Graham)	1	5	6
4. Foundations and Corporations (Mayes)	0	3	5
5. Dinner Address (Raper)	4	3	1
6. Government Grants (Smith)	17	3	7

V. Suggestions for Future Workshops (consolidated):

1. More time for discussion; more on long-range planning and integrating of specific programs; more Title III application information; more specific "do's and don'ts"; more faculty involvement; more private college meetings on other topics, and more meetings with both public and private colleges represented for articulation and cooperation.

2. Workshop on data processing for developing junior colleges is needed; also

3. One on internal administration and procedures.

4. Sharing of innovative programs, and setting up of similar meetings to this one on a semi-annual basis for planning on fund-raising; and schedule inter-campus visits.

5. Round table discussions with informal panels are very very effective; general principles are given, but specific problems and principles are presented more profitably with case studies.

B. THE MONTREAT CONFERENCE
November 1-2, 1968

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Member and Associate Colleges participating:

1. Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Ga.
2. Alice Lloyd College, Ky.
3. Anderson College, S.C.
4. Andrew College, Ga.
5. Arecibo Regional Center, CUPR
6. Arecibo Regional College, IAUPR
7. Bayamon Regional Center, CUPR
8. Chowan College, N.C.
9. Cumberland College, Tenn.
10. Emmanuel College, Ga.
11. Humacao Regional College, UPR
12. Humphreys College, Calif.
13. Lees-McRae College, N.C.
14. Luther Rice College, Va.
15. Mary Holmes College, Miss.
16. Michigan Christian College, Mich.
17. Mitchell College, N.C.
18. Montreat-Anderson College, N.C.
19. Mount Aloysius Junior College, Pa.
20. Mount Olive Junior College, N.C.
21. Norman College, Ga.
22. North Greenville Junior College, S.C.
23. Peace College, N.C.
24. Puerto Rico Junior College, P.R.
25. Reinhardt College, Ga.
26. Spartanburg Junior College, S.C.
27. Union College, N.J.
28. Wingate College, N.C.
29. Wood Junior College, Miss.
30. Young Harris College, Ga.

II. Consultants/Speakers:

1. William Hayes, Ky.
2. Tedd Kelly, Washington, D.C.
3. Kenneth C. MacKay, N.J.
4. Selden Menefee, AAJC, Washington, D.C.
5. Jack Orcutt, AAJC, Washington, D.C.
6. W. Burkette Raper, N.C.
7. Budd E. Smith, N.C.
8. David W. Smith, USOE, Washington, D.C.
9. Richard A. Steele, Miss.
10. Ernest L. Stockton, Tenn.
11. James B. Fahey, N.J.

III. Workshop Evaluations on a five-point scale (36 returns):

(1) Highest (very valuable)	24
(2) Second highest (considerable value)	12
(None lower)	

IV. Agenda Sessions' Value (In order of importance):

	(First)	(Second)	(Third)
1. Opening Session: Planning a Development Program (Kelly) and the AAJC Program (Menefee).	15	5	3
2. Panel Discussion of Development Programs (Presidents Budd Smith, Will Hayes, and E. Stockton)	9	9	4
3. Long-Term Development Programs: Deferred Giving (Fahey). . .	5	3	6
4. Cooperative Education (Steele)	4	6	6
5. Federal Assistance Program (D. Smith).	4	5	4
6. AAJC Study of Private Junior Colleges (MacKay)	0	3	5

(Dr. Raper's presentation was after the evaluation form was filled out.)

V. Suggestions for Future Workshops (consolidated):

1. Include topics on what private colleges can make or contribute to the times, and in what forms state assistance to private colleges are acceptable.

2. Continue to explore areas of concern, such as academic programs for average and below average ability students; motivation techniques, responsibilities, and other areas.

3. Include problem of student recruitment in the program, and make prior survey of member colleges to determine areas of greatest concern to help plan the sessions far in advance.

4. Demonstration on "how" rather than just lectures, through role playing; sharing of ideas on a case-study basis with "this worked with our college" approach, etc. Use outstanding nationally known teachers from various disciplines to stimulate thinking of presidents and deans, with greater use of visual aids.

5. More time for discussions and more active participation of audience. Follow this with more free time for exchange of ideas with other colleges in between sessions.

6. Small group meetings concentrated in specific areas; break-up into groups of 10-12 to discuss topics with consultants after every speaker has spoken, and have a recorder for each group to publish notes and distribute later.

7. Space regional workshops three months apart, with similar institutions with similar problems meeting together with consultative assistance. A series of meetings, regionally and systematically arranged, should be supported by AAJC, foundations, or some other source.

8. New developments in Federal programs, with workshops on how to prepare Federal proposals.

9. More on student relationships with administration and faculty.

10. More printed materials (bibliographies, brochures, etc.)

11. One "inspirational" speech like that given by Dr. Stockton at each conference would be good and most timely.

12. This was one of the best workshops ever attended -- highly beneficial to private colleges.